Katharine Derderian

Leaving Words to Remember

Greek Mourning
& the Advent of Literacy

BRILL

LEAVING WORDS TO REMEMBER

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER • H.W. PLEKET

C.J. RUIJGH • D.M. SCHENKEVELD • P.H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C.J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM NONUM

KATHARINE DERDERIAN

LEAVING WORDS TO REMEMBER

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS

1683

LEAVING WORDS TO REMEMBER

GREEK MOURNING AND THE ADVENT OF LITERACY

BY

KATHARINE DERDERIAN

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
2001

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is also available.

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Mnemosyne / Supplementum]
Mnemosyne : bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill
Früher Schriftenreihe
Teilw. u.d.T.: Mnemosyne / Supplements
Reihe Supplementum zu: Mnemosyne
209. Derderian, Katharine: Leaving words to remember – 2001

Derderian, Katharine:
Leaving words to remember : Greek mourning and the advent of literacy / by Katharine Derderian.–Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2001
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 209)
ISBN 90–04–11750–4

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 11750 4

© Copyright 2001 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments 1

Introduction 3

Chapter One The Unspeakable Lament: the Homeric γόος and the heroes 15

1.1 The Semantics of Homeric Lament 16

1.1.1 Mourning and the Individual: ἄχνυσθαι and ὀδύρεσθαι 17

1.1.2 The 'Spontaneous' Communicative Lament: κλαίειν, κλαυθμός 24

1.2 The Ritual Lament (γόος) 31

1.2.1 The Performance and Structure of γόοι 35

1.2.2 The γόος in the Heroic Milieu 40

1.3 The Hero's Mourning: the Revenge for Patroclus and Odysseus' νόστος 52

Chapter Two The Archaic Epigram and the Advent of Writing 63

2.1 Stand and Take Pity: The Epigram at the Gravesite . . . 76

2.2 Destroying his Youth: The Archaic Epigrams of Warriors 97

2.3 The Persian War Epigrams and the Passage to the Classical Period 102

Chapter Three γράμματα λέγοντα τάδε: Case Studies in Classical Mourning 114

3.1 The Pindaric Threnos 117

3.2 Perspective on Thermopylae: Simonides' Epigram on Megistias (Hdt. 7.228) 127

3.3 Sophocles' *Antigone*: Lament, Burial, and Communication in the Polis 136

Chapter Four The Epitaphios Logos and Mourning in the Athenian Polis 161
4.1 The Epitaphios as an Agnostic Genre 165
4.2 The Epitaphios and History as Praise and Paradigm ... 175
4.3 The Epitaphios as an Oral Genre 181

Chapter Five Some Conclusions 189

Bibliography 195

General Index 203
General Index of Greek Terms 207

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This volume is a revised version of my dissertation, which was submitted to the Department of Classics at Princeton University in 1998.

I owe many thanks to my committee, Profs. Richard Martin, Josh Ober, and Ruth Webb of Princeton University, for their encouragement and their critical insights from near and far, as well as to Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Rösler of the Humboldt-Universität Berlin, whose input also informed the project in its initial stages. Any flaws in the text that remain are my own.

A Mellon Dissertation Grant gave me the time and intellectual space to dedicate to this project – my warmest thanks to the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation for its ongoing support.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my family and especially to Norbert Sack, without whose ὁμοφροσύνη none of this would be possible. I dedicate this book to my grandmothers, Aznive Attarian and Mary Petryk.

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

'Die ursprünglichste Form, gewissermassen die Ur-Erfahrung jenes Bruchs zwischen Gestern und Heute, in der sich die Entscheidung zwischen Verschwinden und Bewahren stellt, ist der Tod... Wir sagen, dass der Tote in der Erinnerung der Nachwelt "weiterlebt," so als handele es sich um eine fast natürliche Fortexistenz aus eigener Kraft. In Wirklichkeit handelt es sich aber um einen Akt der Belebung, den der Tote dem entschlossenen Willen der Gruppe verdankt, ihn nicht dem Verschwinden preiszugeben, sondern kraft der Erinnerung als Mitglied der Gemeinschaft festzuhalten und in die fortschreitende Gegenwart mitzunehmen.' (Jan Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* 33)

Death, together with the grief, mourning, and memorialization that follow it, is an essential and inevitable human event, experienced personally in the light of individual mortality, yet also taking place within larger contexts of political and social belonging; it calls forth personal, collective, and cultural responses which operate at synchronic and diachronic levels, striving both to manage the immediate moment of death and to generate and preserve long-term memory. With this complex communication between individuals and groups across chronological divides, the memorialization and mourning of the dead is one of the most important locations for the study of communication, and in particular the development of written media. Responses to death can be separated into two categories; grief represents the psychological and physiological reaction rooted in human biology[1], while mourning is a culturally defined behavior which represents and reinforces the structure of the group and manages the precarious situation of the survivors by guiding the transition from life to death.[2] This transitional process is initiatory in format[3] and provides a

---

[1] G. J. Baudy, *Exkommunikation und Reintegration: Zur Genese und Kulturfunktion frühgriechischer Einstellungen zum Tod* (Frankfurt, 1980): 129-142. The biologically rooted responses to death in vertebrate animals are separation, grief, and anxious or aggressive excitement. These reactions represent a fight-or-flight impulse on the part of the individual, and a protective maneuver with respect to the group, reactions that are expressed in culturally acceptable venues of mourning and displays of aggression (funeral games, searches for a scapegoat, self-mutilation).

[2] James R. Averill, 'Grief: its nature and significance,' *Psychological Bulletin* 70 (1968): 721-748, R. Blauner, 'Death and Social Structure,' *Psychiatry* 29 (1966): 378-394.

[3] Cf. A. Van Gennep's (*The rites of passage* (Chicago, 1977)) tripartite initiatory process of separation from an old status, liminality, and reintegration into a new status.

framework within which the social personae set in question by death are played out, redistributed, and confirmed, and after which the deceased attains a stable identity as deceased.[4]

The acts of mourning and burial center on three areas of crisis – the body of the deceased, his / her soul, and the survivors; each of these three locations are the setting for transitions that take place through interrelated funerary and mourning procedures: the processing of the body (decay, cremation, burial), the transition of the soul to its new state, and the passage of the survivors through a period of liminality and mourning to a new position within the community.[5] These three areas also represent the points of tension that shape the communication within the funeral ceremony:

1) tension between body and soul: questions of eschatology, the relationship between the body and soul;
2) tension between the survivors and the body: rites of processing and stabilizing the state of the body to reconfirm the social order; and
3) tension between the survivors and the soul or other lasting elements of the dead: the extinction of the social persona of the deceased, the redefinition of the deceased as 'stable dead.'[6]

These multiple levels of communication include interrelated oral, written, iconographic, material, and gestural messages that necessarily negotiate with or exclude each other in significant ways. An investigation of Greek mourning requires us to examine these media in parallel – their relation to death and death ritual, their mediating strategies in the chronological break between present death and future memory, and their role in the social exchanges among the survivors, including the tension between individual and collective mourning, as well as between familial and political authority over mourning.

Scholarship has engaged itself with mourning in the ancient world primarily as a reflection of religious or eschatological belief; mourning has thus received proportionately limited attention in its capacity qua communicative act with multiple, interrelated media and contexts of expres-

---

[4] Paul C. Rosenblatt, R. Patricia Walsh and Douglas A. Jackson, *Grief and Mourning in Cross-Cultural Perspective* (HRAF Press, 1976) 2, 7-8, 87. See also Ian Morris, *Burial and Ancient Society* (Cambridge UP, 1987) 30ff. for the function of the burial ceremony as a rite of passage which reinforces social norms and helps the newly deceased in transition to his / her new identity.

[5] R. Hertz, 'Contribution à une étude sur la représentation collective de la mort,' *L'Année sociologique* 10 (1907): 48-137, esp. 87ff..

[6] R. Huntington and P. Metcalf, *Celebrations of Death: The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual* (Cambridge, 1979) 83.

sion that evolve over time.[7] Studies of individual genres, such as lament, epigram, and funeral oration, have been examined in isolation from each other rather than as thematically and structurally related media that interact synchronically and diachronically. Our evidence for media of mourning ranges from texts performed in formal ritual or civic contexts (Pindaric threnoi, epitaphioi) or texts functioning as artifacts of ritual (grave epigram) to literary and iconographic representations of lament and death ritual, such as Homeric lament, elegy, tragedy, vase art, and grave reliefs. While no single type of source provides a continuous account of ancient mourning over time, all of these media are interrelated through synchronic co-existence and differentiation between contemporary media as well as through diachronic referentiality to essential attributes of all mourning activity within the same culture.

Even texts such as the Homeric poems, which straddle the rift between the historical and the fictional, are historically conditioned in their imagination of the multiple social and cultural possibilities offered by their many different performative contexts over time. Each performance of the poem offers a prefigured world as a common given starting point for its narrative before an audience.[8] In the imaginary representations of the Homeric poems, the performer selects, combines, and redefines existing historical, social, cultural, or literary systems according to the demands of the performative context and this prefigured 'empirical' reality extends to treat the multiple possibilities offered by its historical context; the epic, tragic, and other representations of mourning thus remain necessarily dependent on the historical parameters that determine the range of fictional alternatives acceptable to a contemporary audience.[9] The usual

---

[7] For comprehensive treatment of the written and art historical sources for the nature of death ritual and lament from the Geometric to the classical period, see V. Siurla-Theodoridou, *Die Familie in der griechischen Kunst und Literatur des 8. bis 6. Jahrhunderts* (*Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt* 4) (Munich, 1989) and Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, *'Reading' Greek Death: To the end of the Classical Period* (Oxford, 1995). The former study concentrates on reconstruction of the rites themselves, while the latter focuses on developments in eschatology and media of communication in death ritual.

[8] Wolfgang Iser, *The Fictive and the Imaginary: Charting Literary Anthropology* (Baltimore, 1993) xiv-xix.

[9] Iser 2-5, 10, 13-15, 19-21, 281, 289-291, 298-291. On the mimetic use of *oratio recta* in the Homeric poems, see Victor Bers, *Speech in Speech: Studies in Incorporated Oratio Recta in Attic Drama and Oratory* (Lanham, 1997) 11-9. As later audiences understood them (e.g. Plato *Rep.* 392d8-393c10), the Homeric rhapsodes performed mimesis when the poem represents *oratio recta*; mimetic speeches are clearly bounded by opening and closing formulae as well as other emphatic markers – as opposed to lyric, where the presence of the known author associates *oratio recta* with the poet's voice and requires less marked introductions and conclusions of speech.

self-disclosure of fictional narrative[10] brackets this world as a represented world, making the selections from empirical reality and its alternatives observable to the contemporary audience and requiring its reaction.[11] Yet lest we over-privilege them by contrast, 'non-fictional' or 'historical' sources such as grave epigrams similarly represent texts that mask inherent fictions about the dead, death, or their own societal context in their representation of the dead or the value of death and the dead.[12] When weighing to what degree grave epigrams reflect actual practice of death ritual and eschatological belief and to what degree their function is determined by their poetic form, the expository nature of the grave epigram should not be left unquestioned; simply as a metrical form of expression, it necessarily engages with prior poetic representations of mourning. Thus, while not necessarily offering direct evidence for historical mourning, representations of lament and death ritual are never fully separate from referential connections to generic and thematic conventions current to their audiences as well as their understanding or experience of mourning that engages them in imaginative representation of mourning; this referentiality is particularly relevant to oral cultures and the culture of 'oralcy,' where oral and literate modes of expression coexist.

Following the work of Parry and Lord, scholars have recognized that the repercussions of literacy vary widely according to cultural and historical situation, a factor that calls even the significance of the terms 'orality' and 'literacy' into question.[13] This is hardly surprising, as any culture in any stage of orality, literacy or 'oralcy' is not to be understood according to a simple opposition of script and speech, but according to the entire complex of signs that form that society's system of communication, including written and spoken language, gestures, artifacts, and iconography.[14] In recent scholarship, the binary configuration orality-literacy has

---

[10] On the appeal to the Muse as a reference to an external imagination which creates something not yet existing in the empirical world, i.e. Homer as self-disclosing fiction, see Iser 172.

[11] Iser 16-19.

[12] Iser 1, 12-13.

[13] For a critical survey of the categories developed within the studies of oral tradition, see Ruth Finnegan, *Oral Traditions and the Verbal Arts: A Guide to Research Practices* (London, 1992) 6ff. and Joachim Latacz, Introduction, *Homer: Tradition und Neuerung* (Darmstadt, 1979): 1-23.

[14] See Jack Goody and Ian Watt, 'The Consequences of Literacy,' in *Literacy in Traditional Societies* ed. J. R. Goody (Cambridge, 1968): 27-68, especially 28-33 on the modes of cultural transmission in a non-literate culture: 1) material transmission of personal belongings and natural resources; 2) standardized ways of acting communicated verbally or by imitation; 3) verbal transmission. Verbal transmission consists of the sum of communications in

been called into question at the same time that new fields of inquiry, such as the study of artifacts of performance, kinesics, and proxemics, have been introduced to the philological project.[15] As in other cultures, the history of Greek orality and literacy remains a vexed question: our understanding of Greek culture in its pre-alphabetic state is complicated by the fact that our central evidence for oral-traditional communication lies in the Homeric poems, which are an written exemplar of an oral performance. Further, the duration of 'oralcy,' in which oral and written cultures co-exist, remains elusive, with some scholars proposing oral orientation up until the time of Plato.[16] Granted that the Homeric or archaic audiences may or even must have been aware of writing[17], the majority of communicative performances remain oral, face-to-face situations, drawing on a common referential system which can be mapped alongside written, material, iconographic, and gestural sources to 'read' ancient culture.

Communication within oral-traditional culture represents a constant exchange between the immediate performance and the multiple past usages that form a tradition; each individual usage of a traditional formula, theme, or other sign is a 'metonymy' which stands in for the entire tradition of prior usages.[18] This same referentiality between individual performance and long-term tradition takes place in ancient iconographic and gestural communication as well; not only does each mode of communication relate to the others (e.g. a gesture may inspire ritual speech) but each

---

face-to-face contact between members of the group; the received memory is evaluated and reinterpreted with the passing of time to fit the relevance of the current group and so to preserve that group (the 'homeostatic' culture).

[15] Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke, Introduction, *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece* (Cambridge, 1993) 2, 5-6; Elizabeth C. Fine, *The Folklore Text: From Performance to Print* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1984) 114ff.; James P. Holoka, 'Nonverbal Communication in the Classics: Research Opportunities, in Fernando Poyatos, ed., *Advances in Nonverbal Communication: Sociocultural, Clinical, Esthetic and Literary Perspectives* (Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 1992): 237-254, and Donald Lateiner, 'Heroic Proxemics: Social Space and Distance in the Odyssey,' *TAPA* 122 (1992): 133-163 and *Sardonic Smile: Nonverbal Behavior in Homeric Epic* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1995).

[16] Kevin Robb, *Literacy and Paideia in Ancient Greece* (Oxford, 1994) 191, 218, 232ff. (cf. the critical review of Andrew Ford, *CJ* 91.3 (1996) 338ff.).

[17] The written format of the Homeric performance we possess implies the performer's awareness and use of writing, but the question of the literacy of the Homeric audience is a vexed one. For discussions of the Homeric passages with possible reference to writing, see Carlo Brillante, 'La scrittura in Omero,' *QUCC* 52.1 (1996) 31-45 and Deborah Tarn Steiner, *The Tyrant's Writ: Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece* (Princeton, 1994) 10-16.

[18] John Miles Foley, *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1991) 7-10.

also, individually and collectively, relates to long-term traditions of communication.[19] The isolation of formulaic, thematic, and structural patterns within the Homeric and archaic culture helps re-construct the referential systems in which various communicative acts were performed, the expectations of performers and audience, and the significance of departure from the tradition. With this project, I do not propose to handle every literary, iconographic or archaeological variant, but to identify significant trends in communication within the culture of oralcy as a whole. For Homeric, archaic, and classical sources, I will inquire into the functions and conventional performance situations of mourning – 1) who is present as performer, as primary (overtly addressed, explicitly mentioned) and secondary ('eavesdropping') audience? What is the self-definition of the performers and the performers' representation of the deceased? 2) Where does the performance take place – in an organized ritual or in an informal context, in a personal or in an impersonal grouping? At what time and in which chronological sequence? What is the spatial, temporal, or ideological relationship between the participants? 3) What is the explicit function of the performance? How does each genre mediate the moment of change within the social group caused by the death of one of its members? What are the actions and reactions of the participants, and how do they evaluate the effectiveness of the performance?[20] and 4) What is the relationship between these different media of mourning – verbal and non-verbal performances or texts, gestures, iconography, and burial formats?

The first full-length twentieth-century study of Greek ritual lament is that of Reiner[21], whose study juxtaposes material from vastly different time periods as comparanda (4-6 passim) and relies on the vague assumption that the roots of the γόος-lament lie in 'Volkspoesie' (10). More recently, the Homeric lament has been treated in part by Petersmann[22], but his reading is highly psychologizing; he attempts to trace the relevance of individual spontaneity in performance, but neglects the examina-

---

[19] Anne Mackay, 'Time and Timelessness in the Traditions of Early Greek Oral Poetry and Archaic Vase-Painting,' in Ian Worthington, ed., *Voice Into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* (Leiden, 1996) 43-58, especially 43-45 where Mackay elaborates the similarity in narrative composition of vase art and oral poetic performance, most of all in their use of repeated themes; the standard iconography of figure, stance and scene in visual art parallels formulaic diction and type scenes in oral poetic performance.

[20] Finnegan 91-102.

[21] See Eugen Reiner, *Die Rituelle Totenklage der Griechen* [*Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 30] (Stuttgart, 1938) 18ff.

[22] Gerhard Petersmann, 'Die monologische Totenklage der *Ilias*,' *RhM* 116 (1973): 3-16.

tion of formulaic[23] and structural variation as expression of this individuality. His argument is hampered by his lack of distinction between laments explicitly labeled as γόοι and other expressions of mourning (e.g. wailing) and by a barely defensible distinction between spontaneous and ritually conditioned laments[24]; any speech genre – a supplication, prayer, or γόος – has its particular generic strategies, which must first be defined in order to assess performative spontaneity.

Alexiou's *Ritual Lament*[25] is the first comprehensive scholarly work tracing the historical development of Greek lament from Homeric to modern performance; it has been recently joined by Monsacré's *Les larmes d'Achille*[26], Arnould's *Le rire et les larmes dans la littérature grecque*[27], and Holst-Warhaft's *Dangerous Voices.*[28] Alexiou's broad survey spans a timeline from Homeric poetry to modern Greek performances, a strategy that accommodates few close readings of Homeric and archaic materials for their generic traditions. Similarly, the broad chronological scope of Arnould's and Holst-Warhaft's studies leaves little room for attention to the referential traditions of lament and their interrelationship with other media of mourning. While Arnould focuses more closely on the diachronic development of the semantics of lament from Homeric to classical sources, this study is limited to general observations by its wide chronological range and by its lack of consideration for performance contexts. Similarly, Holst-Warhaft focuses on classical and modern Greek lament, treating Homeric and archaic mourning only in passing. Solely Monsacré's study treats Homeric lament as a performative genre. She views it as an activity of both men and women, but differentiated according to gender by the semantics and gestures of mourning ritual and by the significance of mourning for the individual. While lament diminishes women's physical beauty and under-

---

[23] Here and below, I use 'formula' in Parry's sense – 'an expression regularly used, under the same metrical conditions, to express an essential idea' (Milman Parry, *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, ed. Adam Parry (Oxford UP, 1971).

[24] 'An dieser Stelle bleibt aber zu überlegen... ob derartige Äusserungsformen, falls sie im homerischen Gedicht auftreten, den rituellen Totenklagen zuzurechnen sind... Wie reagiert der homerische Mensch in diesen Augenblick des Leids, reagiert er in kultisch gebundener Weise oder schafft der Dichter Raum für ein individuell verschiedenes Verhalten...?' (4)

[25] Margaret Alexiou, *The ritual lament in Greek tradition* (Cambridge, 1974).

[26] Hélène Monsacré, *Les larmes d'Achille: Les héros, la femme et la souffrance dans la poésie d'Homère* (Paris, 1984).

[27] Dominique Arnould, *Le rire et les larmes dans la littérature grecque d'Homère à Platon* (Paris, 1990); for a similar study dedicated to the semantics of Homeric mourning, see I. Anastassiou, *Zum Wortfeld 'Trauer' in der Sprache Homers* (Hamburg, 1973).

[28] Gail Holst-Warhaft, *Dangerous Voices: women's laments and Greek literature* (London, 1992).

lines their potentiality as slaves of the enemy, men's weeping is a 'feminine' activity that reinforces the hero's status once it is suppressed and surpassed.[29] While advancing our understanding of the place of lament within the Homeric epics, Monsacré's study neglects to isolate the referential system of the Homeric laments and thus fails to deliver an understanding of the lament *qua* communicative genre in relation to other media of mourning and memorialization, such as the σῆμα and the epic; while providing an admirably close reading of Homeric lament, her study necessarily neglects the further influence of the formal and thematic choices in lament during the later shift from orality to literacy.

In my first chapter, I will examine the Homeric representations of lament as our evidence closest to the oral traditions of the genre; the various genres of Homeric lament have neither been studied comprehensively with respect to their thematic referentiality nor in conjunction with a study of performance situation.[30] The Homeric γόος marks the immediate passage from the deceased's past life through the present liminality to a future stable-dead[31] identity; as a ritual mediator between the living and dead personae of the hero, the lament is positioned in formulaic and thematic senses as an anti-epic within the epic poems. As I will argue below, it is only the σῆμα and epic poetry which preserve the identity of the dead diachronically; for the epic with its heroic code pertaining most of all to the living hero, death marks moment when the warrior may disappear from human memory if his identity is not preserved by the σῆμα – itself problematic through its lack of script to preserve the connection of name and gravesite – or by the exclusively heroic epic. As a result of its diachronic ineffectiveness, the lament becomes associated with passivity or the potentially subversive individual interest and thus functions as the opposite of male forms of grief, which are understood as the impulse toward heroic speech and action that generates further κλέος. With the introduction of script, this triad of lament (synchronic oral genre), σῆμα (diachronic material genre), and epic (diachronic oral genre) is resolved by the inscribed grave marker, which combines verbal and material

[29] 34-38, 166, 170, 181-2, 199.

[30] Although Lowenstam has discussed the motion of thigh slapping as a gesture of foreboding of death (Steven Lowenstam, *The Death of Patroklos: A Study in Typology* (Königstein/Ts., 1981).

[31] See Jan Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul* (Princeton, 1983) 92-3 on the transitional period of the newly dead from their ambiguous position between living and dead to an existence as 'stable' dead – paralleling Van Gennep's stages of initiation; and Robert Garland, *The Greek Way of Death* (London, 1985) 13-16 on the ritual stages in the transition of the dead.

strategies of communication. While prior studies have treated lament in isolation from other forms of verbal and material memorial both in and after the Homeric poems, I will argue that the Homeric representation of lament embodies a tradition of tension between paralinguistic, oral, and material memorials that informs the character of the earliest written memorials for the dead and the further development of various genres of commemoration, ranging from the epigram to the classical epitaphios logos.

Perhaps because of limited sources, few studies have treated the subject of memorialization in the archaic period. Through the contributions of Day[32], Ecker[33], Lausberg[34], Raubitschek[35], and Svenbro[36], the various forms of mourning and their interrelationship in the archaic period have begun to be investigated. In examining the archaic epigrams, some of the fundamental questions are how the function and self-thematization of mourning changes with the addition of writing, how the inscribed epigram functions within the culture of oralcy, and how the epigram is interrelated with lament and death ritual. Script at the gravesite differentiates between the polysemous Homeric σῆμα and the inscribed archaic gravesites[37] while oral rhetoric also persists in the epigram. Some discussions simply ignore this oral aspect of the epigram and assume a purely written 'reading' of the epigrams.[38] By contrast, Svenbro's study focuses on the gravestone of Phrasikleia (CEG 24) as one example of the various intersections of the oral and written in an archaic epigraphic context. This epigram reveals the persistently oral nature of reading in ancient Greece: oral communication is crystallized in writing, which is read out loud, returning full circle to the oral.[39] Similarly, Day (26) discusses how

---

[32] Joseph W. Day, 'Rituals in Stone: Early Greek Grave Epigrams and Monuments,' *JHS* 109 (1989): 16-28.

[33] Ute Ecker, *Grabmal und Epigramm: Studien zur frühgriechischen Sepulkraldichtung* [*Palingenesia* XXIX] (Stuttgart, 1990).

[34] M. Lausberg, *Das Einzel-Distichon: Studien zum antiken Epigramm* (*Studia et testimonia antiqua* 19) (Munich, 1982).

[35] A. E. Raubitschek, 'Das Denkmal-Epigram,' *Entretiens Hardt* 14 (1967): 3-26.

[36] Jesper Svenbro, *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca, NY, 1993).

[37] '... dass aber das homerische Grab dem archaischen entspricht ist sicher und für unser Verständnis des Ursprungs der archaischen Kultur aus der Widererweckung der Heroenzeit von grosser Bedeutung.' (Raubitschek 17).

[38] 'Mit ihm [Epigramm] fängt die Literatur an, denn das Epigramm wurde aufgeschrieben um **gelesen** (my emphasis) zu werden, nicht nur von Zeitgenossen, sondern besonders von Nachkommen und späteren Generationen.' (Raubitschek 5)

[39] Svenbro 65.

the first person speech of the deceased or of the personified grave marker engages the reader in a dialogue with the deceased or even in a mimesis of the deceased; this adaptability for various speakers provides the early epigrams with access to the collective memory through its possibilities for communication within various different groups. Yet Day's understanding of the epigrams as a genre of praise does not account for the core function of the inscribed gravemarker as a simultaneously verbal and material genre that supplements lament by recording the connection between the deceased's identity and the location of the gravesite.[40] Lausberg's close readings of the epigrams study their structure and their placement as a written genre on the monument; yet his discussion of the epigram fails to address the developments in traditional conceptions of death, the dead, and mourning within the written context and their referential relationship with oral tradition.

As I will argue in my second chapter, the simultaneously verbal and material character of the epigram dictates its position as an end-product of ritual and as a supplement to lament. The lament persists in the context of archaic and classical ritual as an immediate verbal response to grief. By contrast, the efforts required for the construction, inscription, and erection of the inscribed gravemarker necessitate its placement at the conclusion of the death ritual to which lament belongs. This suggests the position of epigram as a marker of completed death ritual, rather than as a verbatim record of lament. While the oral lament serves a synchronic, familial, and ritual function, epigram offers a new diachronic supplement to lament, a medium aimed at a wider, non-kin group yet also negotiating between oral and written by engaging the reader in written communication with oral characteristics. The linguistic features, themes, and structures typical of lament and its treatment of the ritual passage from life to death are less visible in the epigram than new features associated with writing, such as the citation of the name and identity of the deceased, the names and status of the mourners, and their relationship with the deceased. The epigram's negotiation between oral and written features

---

[40] Day 16-19 argues primarily on the basis of CEG 13 (the epigram of the warrior Tettichos) that the funerary epigram is a genre of praise. The four laudatory aspects Day sees in the epigram (19) do not necessitate the conclusion that praise is the primary function of this or any other epigram: 1) two imperatives demanding pity and sympathy from the reader, 2) universalizing motifs in the address to both citizens and ξένοι; 3) the analogy between epitaph's attempt to attract the traveler-reader's attention and the laudator's attempt to surpass barriers to praise the laudandus; 4) the representation of Tettichos as a behavioral paradigm which the reader should aspire to emulate.

represents the ever-evolving position of writing in archaic and classical societies; its nature as a simultaneously verbal and material genre allows it to adopt new functions as an aesthetic medium, as an object of exchange and as an increasingly historical document.

To develop a holistic picture of the epigram, I will inquire into the relationships between the oral, material, and written characteristics of the epigram: how does the introduction of script affect mourning and memorialization and how does the inscribed epitaph remain effective and accessible in the culture of oralcy? How does the new durability of the epigram affect its negotiation between individual and collective expression?[41] This study will focus on the archaic epigrams for warriors, with their strategies for addressing both the Homeric referential system and the new potential of script; the Persian War epigrams serve as one endpoint of the archaic developments, where war deaths inspire both a departure from the problematic traditions of lament and a new assimilation between epigram and history as memorials for the dead. As I will argue below, the communicative strategies of archaic epigrams represent not only the effects of writing, but also a continued engagement with the traditional problems associated with lament and an ongoing trend toward historical narrative as a memorial.

Finally, there have been no comprehensive studies examining the influence of advancing literacy and of the traditions of lament and epigram on classical forms of expression such as the professional threnos, the public

---

[41] One of the primary problems underlying the studies of epigram, which I will address further below, is a consistent and contradictory trend to claim *both* individualistic expression in the grave monument *and* the typologized aspects of the social personae they represent, verbally and iconographically. See Day 17, where he argues that the core function of the epigram (i.e. the name of the deceased, possibly with patronymic or ethnic designation) is to commemorate an important individual; the 'importance' of the individual is hardly signified through the presence of his / her name, but through terminology of values (e.g. ἀγαθός): the primary position of the name on a grave marker is functional – the connection of grave site with the remains of a particular deceased. Cf. also Sourvinou-Inwood 293-4, who sees the new archaic focus on the μνῆμα's preservation of memory as a sign of individualism, an argument that stands in blatant contradiction to her demonstration that the grave monuments represent less the individual personalities of the deceased but their social roles in relation to the *group*. The move away from intramural burial and the increasing demarcation of child burials in this period likewise fail to reflect individual concerns, but rather collective ones – the monopolization of intramural burial by civic-oriented hero cult and the isolation of various groups of population according to social persona, respectively. For a thorough refutation of Sourvinou-Inwood's connection of archaic individualism and burial practice, see Ian Morris, 'Attitudes Toward Death in Archaic Greece,' *ClasAnt* 8.2 (1989): 296-320: he argues that eschatology and attitudes toward death remain consistent down to the classical period, with change only in the 'communal use made of the dead, in rituals evoking and creating the structure of society'

memorial and the funeral oration, as well as on tragic and historiographic representations of lament in performance. A knowledge of the traditional bases for these genres would help expand our discussion of their generic and sociopolitical relevance. In my third chapter, I will examine the position of lament and epigram in the culture of oralcy by reading several exemplary texts, including Pindar's threnoi, Simonides' epigram on Megistias, and Sophocles' *Antigone*; in my fourth chapter, I will conclude with a discussion of Thucydides' funeral oration of Pericles. These readings will examine the increasingly diversified media developing in response to death, each of which can be shown to engage with or even depend on the pre-existence of lament in its immediate ritual function and on the presence of grave epigram in its material durability to buttress their generic authority, civic priorities, or historical emphasis.

The Athenian epitaphios in particular completes the transition from ritual and epigram as the end-product and record of ritual, to the collective and civic history as a memorial for the dead. The funeral oration's simultaneous acceptance and polemic against the preceding traditions determines its own generic function of historical narrative as praise; the advent of history as the central aspect of memorialization in the Athenian epitaphios represents one end-point of a longer diachronic trend toward memorialization of the dead through its consciously historic record and its analogy between individual and collective memory.

The evolution of different genres of mourning in ancient Greece involves a shift from contemporary ritual transition and mastery of social crisis to collective memory, history, and the increasingly public relevance of mourning – a development which is greatly influenced by the advent of literacy. The inscribed monument takes on a new autonomy apart from lament and the immediate ritual by preserving the stable identity of the dead for each successive reader and ultimately by the development of the public monument, which exists side by side with the private monument, while also offering the possibility of subordinating individual to collective and cultural memory. The pre-existence and ongoing presence of lament within the immediate death ritual and of writing on the material monument ultimately allows for a shift in emphasis toward history as a memorial. By studying the trajectory of mourning from Homeric lament over archaic epigram to the classical period, we can trace how the cultures of orality and oralcy negotiate between public and private, temporary and permanent memorialization, how each mode of mourning creates and retains its authority, and how the introduction of writing shapes the portrayal of the deceased, the mourners, and mourning itself.

CHAPTER ONE

THE UNSPEAKABLE LAMENT: THE HOMERIC ΓΟΟΣ AND THE HEROES

I begin my study by examining the relative positions of the different genres of mourning in the Homeric poems, ranging from lament and the uninscribed σῆμα to the bard's oral performance. By isolating the semantics of Homeric lament and the commonalities in type scenes of mourning and death ritual, I will analyze how various conventions of mourning represented in epic relate to the frame narrative of epic, its heroic code, and its own authoritative strategies of memory. As I will argue below, the Homeric poems privilege active male forms of mourning that create durable or generally accessible artifacts such as the σῆμα or the orally transmitted epic. By contrast, epic represents the female lament as a passive and ephemeral genre designated solely for performance at the singular occasion of the funerary ritual. Epic establishes the priority of its own commemoration over the construction of an uninscribed σῆμα, whose meaning can be variously interpreted and, in turn, the priority of the σῆμα as a diachronically durable and active expression of grief over the female lament, which is limited in its treatment of a single death and divorced from the poetic and paradigmatic traditions of the epic. Nonetheless, lament serves as an essential foil for heroic action and boasting on the battlefield and as a constitutive element of the protagonists' situation in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; the vital interrelationship between lament and heroic action is exemplified by Achilles' individual mourning for Patroclus and by the parallel and corporate mourning of Penelope, Telemachus, and others during Odysseus' prolonged νόστος. These epic representations of mourning and death ritual reflect the ongoing priority attributed to active, material, and collectively accessible responses to grief in later funerary genres. This value system of mourning persists from oral tradition into the culture of oralcy to affect the choices of media as well as the representation of the dead, the mourners, death, and death ritual in the archaic and classical periods.

1.1 *The Semantics of Homeric Lament*

The study of metalanguage describing various forms of lament is crucial to our understanding of the place of lament within the Homeric performance context.[1] The isolation of Homeric speech genres and performance situations necessitates no direct correspondence to historical performances, but represents the referential system of hexametric epic as accepted by the oral or semi-literate audience; this referential system remains only minimally influenced by the nature of the Homeric poems as oral-derived *texts*, as a performance crystallized in writing.[2] The metalanguage of mourning reveals the spectrum of traditional expression encompassed by lament within the epic context. In cross-cultural studies of grief and mourning, weeping is a primary response to another's death, predominantly a female behavior when a gender differentiation exists; the expression of anger and aggression is secondary, but also prevalent and often associated with male response.[3] Accordingly, the Homeric corpus encompasses terms of verbalized and non-verbalized[4] mourning that express gender differences as well as a range of performance settings and levels of activity in response to death, from passivity to aggression.

There exist terms for both verbalized grief (ἄχνυσθαι, ὀδύρεσθαι) and lament (κλαίειν, γόος) as well as for paralinguistic mourning – often onomatopoetic terms expressing the sound of lament, such as ἰάχειν, κωκύειν, μινυρίζειν, μύρεσθαι – each with its own psychological significance, verbal and aural characteristics, and performance situation.[5] Below, I will

---

[1] Richard P. Martin, *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Ithaca, NY, 1989): 10-12; Leonard C. Muellner, *The Meaning of Homeric εὔχομαι through its formulas* [*Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 13] (Innsbruck, 1976) 12-13.

[2] See Foley 15 on the nature of Homer as an 'oral-derived' text and as a transcript of an oral performance which bears the marks of its transcription in writing – yet, as Nagy (*Poetry as performance: Homer and beyond* (Cambridge, 1996) 29ff.) has rightly noted, classical scholarship must remain aware of the pitfalls of assuming variation in the Homeric text as textual change effected upon a text rather than as the multiform results of change during performance of the Homeric poems qua performative genre.

[3] e.g. the association of ἄχνυσθαι with χόλος and the action of revenge at *Il.* 24.583-5: ... ὡς Πρίαμος μὴ ἴδοι υἱόν, / μὴ ὁ μὲν ἀχνυμένῃ κραδίῃ χόλον οὐκ ἐρύσαιτο / παῖδα ἰδών. See Rosenblatt et al. 15-24.

[4] Monsacré 172 draws this distinction between words describing verbalized lament and terms that describe the nonverbalized sounds of lament, but does not elaborate on her definition. I include under 'verbalized' lament both verbs and participles that preface cited speech and first person assertions within other genres of speech (e.g. κλαίω, ὀδύρομαι).

[5] See Huntington and Metcalf 44ff. on the nature of weeping as a culturally determined symbol which each culture defines in its various forms according to function and performance context.

examine in detail this spectrum of Homeric terms for verbalized grief and mourning, ranging from psychological terms of grieving to genres of 'spontaneous' and ritual lament. I will use these word-studies to elucidate the Homeric epics' representation of mourning in various forms and to isolate the values which they associate with different genres of lament.

1.1.1 *Mourning and the Individual: ἄχνυσθαι and ὀδύρεσθαι*

ἄχνυσθαι and ὀδύρεσθαι are two of the predominant terms for mourning in the Homeric poems; by investigating these two terms and their relationship with other types of mourning and ritual action, I will illustrate the epic's thematization of the tensions between individual and collective expression and between active and reactive responses to death. By examining the values and problems epic associates with mourning, I will establish a basis for my discussion of the epic representation of lament in informal and ritual contexts. As I will show below, terms of individual and collective mourning reveal a preference for responses to grief that include action or speech leading to further action (ἄχνυσθαι), while lament and passive behaviors accompanying it are characteristically prone to interruption for a return to action (ὀδύρεσθαι). The examination of these general terms for mourning reveal the epic's privileging of active, material, and collectively accessible memorials, an ideology which shapes the interrelationship of lament, the σῆμα, and epic itself.

ἄχνυσθαι appears in various contexts of individual grief and is often associated with male mourners' grief over the death of a companion, which must be resolved by actions of revenge or ritual.[6] Typically, a named male hero grieves for another named hero, ἑταῖρος, or kin within a martial or ritual context in which the male mourner is in the immediate presence or proximity of the dead (ἴδοι...ἰδών, *Il.* 24.583-5 [Priam]). The mourner's grief inspires a spectrum of responses, ranging from active to

---

[6] Similarly, ἄχος can appear as mainly individual male grief, always functioning as an indicator of personal interest in the fate of the deceased and often expressed in active and exterior signals: Achilles' various mourning gestures at Patroclus' death (*Il.* 18.22ff.), Priam's grief at the imagined death of Hector (22.42-3), Menelaus for Odysseus (*Od.* 4.107-110), Penelope seated on the ground mourning for Telemachus (4.716), Odysseus weeping at the bard's song about Troy (8.530-541), Odysseus with his mother in Hades (11.208). The exceptional cases here are that of Helen, the one female who refers to herself as ἀχνυμένη κῆρ (*Il.* 24.773) and Penelope, who is said to experience ἄχος (*Od.* 4.716) – both instances immediately preceding the performance of a γόος lament; perhaps this is because Penelope's role as practical head of the Ithacan household in the absence of Odysseus and Telemachus and Helen's role as the 'cause' of the Trojan war ascribe to them a certain amount of male agency connected with the very people for whom they lament.

aggressive behavior. The mourner may perform duties to the body despite (περ[7]) grief, such as the protection of the dying on the battlefield (*Il.* 13.419-420 [Antilochus and Hypsenor]) or the performance of death ritual among ἑταῖροι:

> ...ἐν δὲ μέσοισι φέρον Πάτροκλον ἑταῖροι.
> θριξὶ δὲ πάντα νέκυν καταείνυσαν, ἃς ἐπέβαλλον
> κειρόμενοι. ὄπιθεν δὲ κάρη ἔχε δῖος Ἀχιλλεὺς
> ἀχνύμενος. ἕταρον γὰρ ἀμύμονα πέμπ' Ἄιδοσδε (*Il.* 23.134-7).

Alternatively, the mourner returns to action despite grief[8], another usage of ἄχνυσθαι which also appears with περ and εἴασε; the mourner interrupts mourning for a return to action, often with the acceptance of death as god-given: τέκνον ἐμόν, τοῦτον μὲν ἐάσομεν ἀχνύμενοί περ / κεῖσθαι, ἐπεὶ δὴ πρῶτα θεῶν ἰότητι δαμάσθη (*Il.* 19.8-9 [Thetis]).[9]

The male mourner's action typically represents a continuation of martial activity, such as Hector's replacement of his dead charioteer (*Il.* 8.124-9), or, alternatively, the grieving warrior may take an immediate action of revenge on the person who killed his comrade:

> τοὺς [the Aiantes] ὑποτάρβαντες ἐχώρησαν πάλιν αὖτις
> Ἕκτωρ Αἰνείας τ' ἠδὲ Χρομίος θεοειδής,
> Ἄρητον δὲ κατ' αὖθι λίπον δεδαϊγμένον ἦτορ,
> κείμενον. Αὐτομέδων δέ θο' ἀτάλαντος Ἄρηϊ
> τεύχεα τ' ἐξενάριζε καὶ εὐχόμενος ἔπος ηὔδα·
> ἦ δὴ μὰν ὀλίγον γε Μενοιτάδαο θανόντος
> κῆρ ἄχεος μεθέηκα χερείονά περ καταπεφνών (*Il.* 17.533-9).[10]

---

[7] See Anastassiou 30-2 on the function of περ with the present participle of ἄχνυσθαι: 1) the resulting action occurs despite the mourner's passivity or depression (e.g. the warrior protecting his wounded comrade, *Il.* 13.419ff.); 2) action continues and an emotional outbreak is prevented by circumstances (e.g. Hector's replacement of his dead charioteer, *Il.* 8.125ff.), 3) the actual action is different from the expectation or the desire of the character(s) (e.g. Hector kills Periphetes in the presence of his helpless comrades, *Il.* 15.650-2).

[8] *Il.* 8.125-9 (= 316-9) (death and replacement of Hector's charioteer), 17.459 (Automedon continues fighting after his comrade's death), 19.8-11 (Thetis encourages Achilles to endure the pain of Patroclus' death and receive arms from Hephaestus).

[9] *Il.* 24.523-6 (Achilles and Priam), cf. *Od.* 11.556-560, where Odysseus tries to assuage Ajax's anger by emphasizing the role of the gods in his death. On the tension between 'letting go' of care (μεθίεσθαι, ἐᾶν) or being paralyzed by cares in the *Iliad*, see M. Lynn-George, 'Structures of care in the *Iliad*,' *GRBS* 46.1 (1996): 4.

[10] cf. *Il.* 13.403 (Deiphobus shoots at Idomeneus in revenge for Asios), 18.320-2 (metaphor of Achilles as an angry lion stalking the hunter who takes its offspring); cf. ἄχος at *Il.* 13.581ff. (Menelaus attacks Helenus in revenge for Deipyrus), 16.581-5 (Patroclus charges forward to avenge his grief for Epeigeus).

This particular incident of revenge is especially relevant in that it is marked not only by a return to martial action, but by a displacement of mourning by a renewed boasting speech that is characteristic of heroic activity on the battlefield; as I will argue below, the warrior's boasting often draws upon this idea of the victor resolving grief or imposing grief on the victim's mourners and so highlights the vital interconnection of lament and martial action.

Similar to the usage of ἄχνυσθαι of personal mourning among individual male companions, the verb can also be used of an individual grieving for someone in his / her protection or for a group of subordinates[11]; this usage is usually constructed with a singular participle accompanied by περ in a concessive sense and is often associated with the subject's passivity due to lack of control over the situation:

> ᾧ...τότε δ' οὔ τι δυνήσεαι [Agamemnon] ἀχνύμενός περ
> χραισμεῖν, εὖτ' ἂν πολλοὶ ὑφ' Ἕκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο
> θνήσκοντες πίπτωσι... (*Il.* 1.241-3).

The term ἄχνυσθαι also appears in contexts of collective grief, serving as a corporate version of the personally motivated mourning among male companions. The collective usage of ἄχνυσθαι may mark the mourning of a group of ἑταῖροι for a named male ἑταῖρος.[12] Alternatively, a group of men may mourn for an individual or a group of deceased men in a martial setting as they perform ritual or other customary activities, such the transportation, the cremation or burial of the body, or the attainment of recompense[13]; participants consist of the κηδεμόνες, or mourners accompanied by kin.[14] Thus, in general, ἄχνυσθαι indicates personally motivated grief of individual men within the network of ἑταῖροι or kin, a grief which necessitates the consideration of possible action to resolve the loss.

The verb ἄχνυσθαι is a psychological term often connected with the κῆρ[15] and various other psychic organs, such as the φρήν, κραδίη, or θυμός.

---

[11] *Il.* 18.62 = 443 (Thetis to the Nereids and Hephaestus on her inability to help the grieving Achilles).

[12] *Il.* 15.650-2 (Periphetes and his comrades), 16.599-600 (Bathykles and the Achaeans).

[13] transportation of the body: *Il.* 13.657-8 (Harpalion); cremation or burial: *Il.* 7.428 = 431 (mass burials), 23.165 (Patroclus), *Od.* 12.11-15 (Elpenor); recompense: *Od.* 24.420ff. (suitors' relatives).

[14] explicitly named κηδεμόνες: *Il.* 23.163 (Patroclus); kin together with other mourners: *Il.* 13.658 (Harpalion mourned by the Paphlagonians and his father).

[15] *Il.* 7.428 (Trojans), 431 (Achaeans); 23.165 (Patroclus), *Od.* 11.208 (Odysseus for his mother).

Also the φρήν: *Il.* 8.124 = 316 (Hector for his charioteer), *Od.* 8.541 (Odysseus at the

It describes an inner state of grief that endures beyond the immediate recognition of death[16] and is expressed through distinct action, ritual, or lament – γόος[17], κλαίειν[18], ὀδύρεσθαι[19], or στενάχειν.[20] The nature of ἄχνυσθαι as individual and collective psychological reaction is closely bound to the connection of the individual or group with a deceased or group of deceased characterized as ἑταῖροι.[21] Accordingly, the verb ἄχνυσθαι designates a state which the mourner notes explicitly only in collective situations where s/he is mourning together with a larger group[22]; otherwise, ἄχνυσθαι figures either as a common grief shared by the speaker and his communication partner(s) or is noted by an observer who recognizes the other's grief.[23] Although it is a term signifying personal involvement with the cause of grief, ἄχνυσθαι remains consistently associated with collective grief or with individual grief in relation to the community and to the ἑταῖροι in particular.[24]

---

bard's song), 10.247 (Eurylochus tells Odysseus and the crew about Circe); the κραδίη: *Il.* 23.47 (Achilles for Patroclus), 24.584 (Priam for Hector), *Od.* 4.548 (Menelaus for Agamemnon); and the θυμός: *Od.* 4.548 (Menelaus for Agamemnon), 14.169 (Eumaius for Odysseus). Constructions in which the seat of the emotions is the subject of ἄχνυσθαι reinforce the psychological nature of the term, e.g. *Od.* 14.169-170: ἦ γὰρ θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἐμοῖσιν / ἄχνυται, ὁππότε τις μνήσῃ κεδνοῖο ἄνακτος. On the localization of ἄχνυσθαι in bodily organs, see also Anastassiou 9-10, 28-29.

[16] See Anastassiou 10-13 on ἄχνυσθαι as a psychological state persisting beyond the initial recognition of death, e.g. in Menelaus' reaction to his brother's death, where the immediate response (αὐτὰρ ἐμοί γε κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ *Od.* 4.538) can be differentiated from the long-term emotional state brought about by Agamemnon's death (ἐμοὶ κραδίη καὶ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ... καὶ ἀχνυμένῳ περ ἰάνθη *Od.* 4.548–9).

[17] e.g. the lament of Achilles and Priam *Il.* 24.522-6:

...ἄλγεα δ' ἔμπης
ἐν θυμῷ κατακεῖσθαι ἐάσομεν ἀχνύμενοί περ
οὐ γάρ τις πρῆξις πέλεται κρυεροῖο γόοιο,
ὡς γὰρ ἐπεκλώσαντο θεοὶ δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι,
ζώειν ἀχνυμένους...

[18] e.g. οὐδ' εἴα κλαίειν Πρίαμος μέγας. οἱ δὲ σιωπῇ / νεκροὺς πυρκαϊῆς ἐπενήνεον ἀχνύμενοι κῆρ (*Il.* 7.428 = 431, cf. Helen's γόος, *Il.* 24.773).

[19] e.g . τῶν πάντων οὐ τόσσον ὀδύρομαι ἀχνύμενός περ, / ὡς ἑνός, οὗ μ' ἄχος ὀξὺ κατοίσεται Ἄϊδος εἴσω / Ἕκτορος... *Il.* 22.424-5, cf. *Il.* 24.549-550 (Achilles to Priam), *Od.* 4.104 (Menelaus for Odysseus); cf. Anastassiou 19 and 23 on ὀδύρεσθαι as a result and as an expression of ἄχνυσθαι.

[20] *Il.* 18.318-323 (Achilles for Patroclus).

[21] in individual mourning: *Il.* 8.125 = 317 (Hector's charioteer), 13.419 (Antilochus for Hypsenor), 17.459 (Automedon for Patroclus), 18.316-320 (Achilles for Patroclus); in collective mourning *Il.* 15.650-1 (comrades for Periphetes).

[22] πολῖται *Il.* 22.424-9 (Priam for Hector), δῆμος *Il.* 24.773-6 (Helen for Hector); though see also *Od.* 4.104 (Menelaus for Odysseus) for a smaller domestic situation.

[23] *Il.* 18.62 = 18.443, 19.8 (Thetis on Achilles' grief), 24.523-6 (Achilles to Priam on their common grief), *Od.* 11.558 (Odysseus on his and the Achaean's grief at Aias' death), 12.12 (Odysseus on his and his crew's grief over Elpenor).

[24] cf. Gregory Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore, 1979) 98-101, 112-114. Nagy shows how individual and collective ἄχος are related

Following a death, ἄχνυσθαι is only minimally verbalized – mainly in recognition of the mourner's psychological state and in connection with adhortations to action instead of mourning. When characters *anticipate* a death, however, ἄχνυσθαι is more closely associated with verbal communication: it characterizes the emotion at remembering, hearing or narrating about death or another negative event with potentially deadly results.[25] That ἄχνυσθαι has a stronger communicative aspect with anticipated death illustrates the active nature of the verb – the anticipation of a possible death allows for inquiry or warning, while the fact of death requires heroic action in response to grief. Both the individual and collective usages of ἄχνυσθαι involve large-scale ritual activity or the subordination of mourning activity to actions of protection or revenge carried out as the situation permits:

> εἰ δέ κεν ἐντανύσω διοϊστεύσω τε σιδήρου,
> οὔ κέ μοι ἀχνυμένῳ τάδε δώματα πότνια μήτηρ
> λείποι ἅμ' ἄλλ' ἰοῦσ', ὅτ' ἐγὼ κατόπισθε λιποίμην
> οἷός τ' ἤδη πατρὸς ἀέθλια κάλ' ἀνελέσθαι (*Od.* 21.114-117).

The liminality of Telemachus' situation lies in the lack of clarity about his father's death, which complicates his passage from youth to manhood; clear proof of Odysseus' death and a tomb to provide his offspring with κλέος (*Od.* 1.239-248) would enable the smooth transition of Odysseus' goods to his adult son and the remarriage of his wife. In his grief (μοι ἀχνυμένῳ, *Od.* 21.115), Telemachus faces a choice between action and

---

in the *Iliad* – Achilles' individual ἄχος results in his μῆνις and creates ἄχος for the Achaeans at large, a social dimension of grief that operates among the Homeric warriors. The narration of epic action represents either πένθος / ἄχος (grief, with implicit lament) or κλέος (i.e. epic poetry), depending on the listener's involvement with the subject involved, as for example at *Od.* 8.516-531, where Demodocus' song inspires the ἄχος of Odysseus at his remembrance of the Trojan war. Thus, ἄχος is also shown to have an intimate connection to κλέος, as the pole of personal remembrance over against epic celebration of heroic activity. It is for this reason that the Homeric epic treats only the death and ἄχος for Patroclus directly, while Achilles remains the subject of the epic, the focus of κλέος – to portray his death would be an ἄχος, a theme unsuitable for the epic since the audience is personally involved with Achilles as a cult hero.

[25] *Od.* 4.553 (Menelaus asking Odysseus' whereabouts), 7.297 (Odysseus' supplication to Arete), 8.478 (Odysseus' gift to Demodocus), 10.67 (Odysseus to Aeolus), 12.153ff., 270ff. (Odysseus tells his crew about the Sirens and the isle of Helios), 14.170, 375-6 (Eumaeus on Odysseus), cf. Persephone's admission that she has eaten the pomegranate which requires her to remain in Hades (i.e. death, *H. H. Dem.* 433). ἄχνυσθαι describes both the emotions of the souls in Hades (*Od.* 11.542 [group], 24.21 [Agamemnon]) and those of visitors to Hades, often with δάκρυ χέειν (Odysseus' crew traveling to Hades *Od.* 10.570, 11.5, 466).

inaction – between the stretching of the bow and revenge on the suitors and allowing his mother to re-marry and the suitors to further deplete his father's οἶκος. It is action alone that will serve as a provisional admission of Odysseus' death, allow Telemachus' accession to his father's status, and put an end to the liminality within the Ithacan household.

This activity and collective orientation following the death of kin or ἑταῖροι is a definitive aspect of ἄχνυσθαι which characterizes it as a heroic and predominantly male mode of grief. Its active nature connects it with speech that motivates action (e.g. to save a person in danger) and action that inspires speech (e.g. a boast of revenge). As we shall see below, this activity and speech connected with continued activity characterizes ἄχος in contrast to other forms of verbalized mourning, where speech often interrupts mourning for action (ὀδύρεσθαι) or where the γόος lament concludes the further generation of κλέος for the hero following its performance in death ritual.

The verb ὀδύρεσθαι represents a more individual response to death than ἄχνυσθαι. It most often indicates personally-motivated mourning for the dead or those expected to be dead: καὶ γάρ τίς τ' ἀλλοῖον ὀδύρεται ἄνδρ' ὀλέσασα / κουρίδιον, τῷ τέκνα τέκῃ φιλότητι μιγεῖσα (*Od.* 19.265-6[26] [Od. to Pen.]). The mourner is either an individual in isolation or one mourner who is distinguished from other mourners, either through the marker ἑτέρωθεν or by the notation of personal concerns.[27] In what appears to be a collective version of the individual's personally-motivated mourning, ὀδύρεσθαι also can be used of the weeping of a group for its hero in a public and non-ritual situation[28]; yet, Agamemnon's interruption of the collective lament for Patroclus to limit the ritual activity to the κηδεμόνες seems to suggest that this general popular lament exists in tension with the personally-motivated mourning of kin or κηδεμόνες:

---

[26] cf. *Il.* 23.222-4: ὡς δὲ πατὴρ οὗ παιδὸς ὀδύρεται ὀστέα καίων, / νυμφίου, ὅς τε θανὼν δειλοὺς ἀκάχησε τοκέας, / ὣς Ἀχιλεὺς ἑτάροιο ὀδύρετο ὀστέα καίων; 24.46-8 (Apollo on Achilles): μέλλει μέν πού τις καὶ φίλτερον ἄλλον ὀλέσαι, / ἠὲ κασίγνητον ὁμογάστριον ἠὲ καὶ υἱόν, / ἀλλ' ἦ τοι κλαύσας καὶ ὀδυράμενος μεθέηκε. Cf. Odysseus' response to Demodocus' song as an indication of his personal connection to the narrative (*Od.* 8.577).

[27] *Il.* 2.315 (sparrow-mother for her children), 18.32-4 (Antilochus for Patroclus), 19.344-5 (Achilles for Patroclus), 22.424-6 (Priam for Hector), 23.222-5, 24.46-8, 128 (Achilles for Patroclus), 549-551 (Priam for Hector); *Od.* 1.242-4 (Telemachus for Odysseus), 4.100-112 (Menelaus for Odysseus), 799-801, 819, 828 (Penelope for Odysseus and Telemachus), 11.214 (Odysseus for his mother in Hades), 14.39-42 (Odysseus to Eumaeus), 129 (Penelope for Odysseus), 142-4 (Eumaeus for Odysseus), 16.194-5 (Telemachus for Odysseus), 18.202-5, 19.46, 265-7, 513-7 (Penelope).

[28] *Il.* 23.152-155 (communal mourning for Patroclus), 24.713-4, 740 (collective mourning for Hector).

καὶ νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδυ φάος ἠελίοιο,
εἰ μὴ Ἀχιλλεὺς αἶψ' Ἀγαμέμνονι εἶπε παραστάς·
ὦ Ἀτρεΐδη... γόοιο μὲν ἔστι καὶ ἆσαι,
νῦν δ' ἀπὸ πυρκαϊῆς σκέδασον καὶ δεῖπνον ἄνωχθι
ὅπλεσθαι. τάδε δ' ἀμφὶ πονησόμεθ' οἷσι μάλιστα
κήδεός ἐστι νέκυς. παρὰ δ' οἵ τ' ἀγοὶ ἄμμι μενόντων.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσεν ἄναψ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνον,
αὐτίκα λαὸν μὲν σκέδασεν κατὰ νῆας ἐΐσας,
κηδεμόνες δὲ παρ' αὖθι μένον καὶ νήεον ὕλην... (*Il.* 23.154-160[29]).

Similar to ἄχνυσθαι, ὀδύρεσθαι is localized in the θυμός[30]: with its roots in personal motivation, ὀδύρεσθαι signifies both the action of lament and the psychological state of yearning for the deceased; this subjective aspect of ὀδύρεσθαι allows it to encompass or accompany κλαυθμός and γόος, the culturally programmed modes of lament.[31] Thus, like κλαυθμός or γόος, ὀδύρεσθαι can thus also arise in concert with ritual activity, such as offerings of hair (*Il.* 23.152-4) or the burning of bones (*Il.* 23.222-5), although this is not its primary context.

Unlike other forms of mourning, the psychological ὀδύρεσθαι is rarely commented upon as externally visible, but is expressed in the majority of cases aurally by στεν- verbs[32] and visually by sparse conventional mourning gestures of tears and sitting.[33] Mourners either verbalize ὀδύρεσθαι in the first person or an outsider notes the mourner's state, often with the intent to interrupt what is viewed as ineffective mourning for ritual or other conventional actions to resolve grief. The verb never prefaces direct speech.[34]

---

[29] Cf. also Priam's interruption of the people's mourning to take Hector's body to the family house *Il.* 24.713-7.

[30] *Il.* 24.549 (Achilles on Priam), *Od.* 8.577 (Alcinous on Odysseus), 9.12-3 (Odysseus' response to bard), 18.203 (Penelope), cf. *Il.* 9.612 (the effect of Phoenix's speech on the grieving Achilles)

[31] With γόος: *Il.* 23.152-4 (Achaeans for Patroclus), *Od.* 4.800-1 (Penelope), 16.144-5 (Laertes); with κλαυθμός: *Il.* 24.48 (mourner); *Od.* 4.800-1 (Penelope), 8.577 (Odysseus' response to the bard).

[32] i.e. nonverbalized mourning; *Il.* 18.33 (ἔστενε), 23.225 (στεναχίζων), *Od.* 1.243 (στεναχίζω), 9.12-3 (στονόεντα... στεναχίζω), 11.214 (στεναχίζω), 14.39 (στοναχάς), 16.144 (στοναχῇ), 16.195 (στεναχίζω).

[33] *Il.* 19.345 (ἧσται), *Od.* 4.101 (καθήμενος), 14.39-41 (ἧμαι), 16.144-5 (ἧσται).

[34] ὀδύρομαι *Il.* 22.424 (Priam for Hector), *Od.* 4.104 (Menelaus for Odysseus), 819 (Penelope), 14.142 (Eumaeus for Odysseus), ὀδυρόμενος / ἢ [στεναχίζω or καὶ ἀχεύων] *Il.* 24.128 (Thetis to Achilles), *Od.* 1.243 (Telemachus for Odysseus), 4.100 (Menelaus for Odysseus), 11.214 (Odysseus and his mother), 16.195 (Telemachus for Odysseus).
ὀδύρεσθαι is often noted by others and interrupted because of lack of effectiveness (*Il.* 24.549-551 (Achilles to Priam) and in particular for ritual, conventional, or other action to resolve the situation: *Il.* 23.154-160 (Achilles to Agamemnon), 24.128-137 (Thetis to Achilles), 713-7 (Priam to Trojans), *Od.* 4.193ff. (Antilochos to Menelaus), 828 (Penelope's sister in dream), 5.160 (Calypso to Odysseus), 16.220-4 (Telemachus to Odysseus).

ὀδύρεσθαι can be connected with the mourner's ἄχος[35], yet apparently lacks the force of ἄχνυσθαι, as for example in this recurring pattern of comparison between general concern for a group as outweighed by the mourning for a preferred individual: τῶν πάντων οὐ τόσσον ὀδύρομαι ἄχνυμενός περ / ὡς ἑνός, οὗ μ' ἄχος ὀξὺ κατοίσεται Ἄϊδος εἴσω, / Ἕκτορος (*Il.* 22.424-6[36]). It also lacks the aggressive nature of ἄχνυσθαι, where grief motivates the mourner to action and revenge[37]; instead, ὀδύρεσθαι unifies the individual psychology and the conventional activity of mourning. Thus, unlike ἄχνυσθαι, where grief motivates the hero to action according to the context, ὀδύρεσθαι is viewed as passive[38] and is prone to be interrupted for passage to other activity at a specific point in time.[39]

The Homeric terminology for mourning and grief reveals the relative value the epic narrative places on activity in response to death or grief; consistently, it demonstrates the tensions between individual and collective expression and between alternative reactions to grief through various modes of speech and action. These concerns form an integral part of the Homeric poems' portrayal of grief and mourning and also influence their characterization of lament, as I will argue below. Although the contrast between ὀδύρεσθαι and ἄχνυσθαι, i.e. between individual-passive and collective-active grief, does not entail a contrast along gender lines, the terminology for both active and passive **grief** is used more of men in general than the terminology of 'spontaneous' and ritual **lament**, the verbal expression of grief which is predominantly female.

1.1.2 *The 'Spontaneous' Communicative Lament: κλαίειν, κλαυθμός*

In the following discussion, I will examine our evidence for the informal 'spontaneous' uses of lament (κλαίειν, unquoted γόος) and the ritual lament within the singular context of the death ritual (γόος). The informal κλαυθμός and γόος are performed both by men and by women, while the

---

[35] The noun and verbal forms ἄχος and ἄχνυσθαι often appear as the accompaniment or cause of ὀδύρεσθαι: *Il.* 22.424-6 (Priam for Hector), 23.222-3 (Achilles for Patroclus), 24.549-550 (Priam), *Od.* 4.100 (Menelaus for Odysseus), 15.355-7 (Laertes); cf. also the set formula ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχεύων *Il.* 24.128 (Thetis to Achilles), *Od.* 4.100 (Menelaus for Odysseus), 14.40 (Odysseus to Eumaeus).

[36] Cf. Menelaus on Odysseus at *Od.* 4.104-7.

[37] *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* s.v. ὀδύρομαι.

[38] ὀδύρεσθαι appears in situations where the subject is unwillingly inactive (e.g. Odysseus on Calypso's island, *Od.* 1.55, 5.156-161) or yearns for his / her own or another's homecoming (*Od.* 8.33, 10.484-6, 13.219-221, 379-381).

[39] Often associated with cycles of day and night, the approach of dawn or dusk: *Il.* 24.713 (Priam to Trojans), *Od.* 4.193-5 (Antilochos to Menelaus), 16.220 (Telemachus to Odysseus).

ritual performance of the γόος is limited to female performers; Achilles is the one exception, to be discussed in greater detail below. This contrast between informal and ritual lament reveals the epic's differentiation between private grief and mourning and the lament as a conventional element of ritual. Both genres involve the creation of a narrative about the dead that mediates between his past life and present death within a group context; yet the epic distinguishes between the gender-neutral modes of informal mourning and the universally female performance of the ritual lament, a distinction that also positions the cited γόος as a singular ritual element in opposition to the action-oriented and recurring forms of male mourning such as ἄχνυσθαι. Despite the ritual lament's recurring thematic and structural characteristics, epic represents it as a genre associated with the singular and liminal occasion of death ritual and thus as the opposite of the durable and continually accessible material σῆμα and of the epic's own project of preserving and transmitting heroic memory.

When κλαίειν appears as a term for individual mourning, a relative or other individual mourns for a man within an informal or private group setting[40] or an individual male mourns over his own anticipated death.[41] When used as a term for collective mourning, κλαίειν usually marks an undefined group performing mourning accompanied by spontaneous or ritual gesture – one group of unnamed men mourning for another in the context of funeral activity (*Il.*7.427); a group mourning for its hero or kin, often while performing ritual gestures[42]; or, most often, a female group or an individual woman accompanied by a group of women lamenting in a domestic setting for an individual hero whose death has occurred or is expected.[43] κλαίειν signifies informal but conventional mourning for the dead in a verbalized format or in nonverbalized sounds[44] which are designated as shrill (λιγύς) or compared to birdsong.[45] It is likewise associated with the fulfill-

---

[40] *Il.* 19.5 (Achilles for Patroclus), 286 (Briseis for Patroclus), 24.619-620 (Priam for Hector).

[41] e.g. *Od.* 10.496-500 (Odysseus learns from Circe of his fated journey to Hades).

[42] *Il.* 20.210-1 (parents of Achilles or Aeneas will mourn their son's death), 23.252-4 (cremation of Patroclus), 24.712-7 (Trojans for Hector), *Od.* 24.63-4 (immortals and mortals for Achilles).

[43] *Il.* 18.340 (Achilles forces Trojan women to mourn for Patroclus), 24.84-6 (Thetis and Nereids mourn Achilles' imminent death), *Od.* 1.362-364 (Penelope and servants for Odysseus), 3.260-1 (Nestor on absence of Achaean women's mourning for Agamemnon), 16.449-451, 19.600-4, 20.92, 21.356-8 (Penelope and servants for Odysseus).

[44] *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* s.v. κλαίω, κλαυθμός.

[45] λιγύς: *Il.* 19.5 (Achilles for Patroclus), *Od.* 10.201 (Odysseus' crew), 11.391 (Agamemnon's ghost), 21.56 (Penelope and Odysseus' bow); comparison with birdsong: *Od.* 16.216 (Odysseus and Telemachus). Cf. Arnould 145.

ment of duties to the deceased through self-disfigurement in physical identification with the dead, and through interchange among the mourning group, either through common ritual activity, or more often through alternation of individual κλαυθμος with group στενάχεσθαι[46] or μύρεσθαι.[47]

---

[46] στένειν / -άχειν / -αχέσθαι / -αχίζειν and στόνος / στοναχή have various meanings and contexts, all of which are nonverbalized and emphasize the nature and perhaps the volume of its sound (e.g. στενάχειν of a current of water, *Il.* 16.391). The nouns στόνος and στοναχή often occur as the sound of warriors in general battlefield contexts (στοναχή *Il.* 2.39-40, 356, 590), and particularly in group scenes of wounding and death (στόνος *Il.* 10.483-4, 21.20-1, *Od.* 23.40-1; στοναχή *Od.* 21.237, 383); in contexts of lament, στοναχή appears with κλαίειν (Achilles and Priam, *Il.* 24.509-512), οἰμωγή (transportation of Hector's body to Troy *Il.* 24.696), and γόος (*Il.* 18.314-8 [Achaeans for Patroclus], 354-5 [Myrmidons for Patroclus], *Od.* 16.144 [Laertes]), suggesting the sound of the lament proper or a mourning sound that accompanies it. στενάχειν / -ίζειν designates individual mourning at one's own wounding (often with βαρύ: *Il.* 8.332-4 [Teucer], 13.421-3 [Hypsenor], 538-9 [Deiphobus], 14.432 [Hector]; *Od.* 9.415 [wounded Cyclops]) or at one's own danger or death (*Il.* 16.489 [bull dying under attack of a lion, as a metaphor for Patroclus' death]; *Od.* 4.516 [Agamemnon driven apart from others by seastorm], 5.420 [Odysseus' fear of storm], 429 [Odysseus in waves]; 7.274, 23.316-7 [Odysseus' fear of storm]) or a relative / comrade (*Il.* 4.153-4 [Agamemnon at Menelaus' wound], 18.70 [Achilles for Patroclus], 24.639-640 [Priam for Hector]; *Od.* 1.243 [Telemachus for Odysseus], 11.214 [Odysseus for mother], 16.194-5 [Telemachus for Odysseus]). στενάχειν / -ίζειν is the only form which can preface speech (*Il.* 4.153-4 [Agamemnon and Menelaus], 18.78 [Achilles for Patroclus], 323 [Achilles for Patroclus]). It often emphasizes the isolation of the mourner, even when the mourner is situated within a larger group, as when Achilles mourns Patroclus among his companions (*Il.* 23.59-61, 24.122-4). It also occurs in an alternating format, with collective (ἀνα- / ἐπι-)στεναχέσθαι in response to individual στενάχειν (*Il.* 4.153-4 [Agamemnon and companions for wounded Menelaus], 18.314-8 [Achilles and Achaeans for Patroclus]), or other forms of lament (as a response to κλαιειν *Il.* 19.301 [women's response to Briseis' lament], 338 [old men's response to Achilles' lament], 22.515, 24.746 [women's response to Andromache's lament]); to or with a γόος *Il.* 18.354-5 [Myrmidons for Patroclus], 22.515 [women's response to Andromache's lament], 23.1 [Trojans for Hector], 24.746 [women's response to Andromache's lament], *Od.* 9.467 [Odysseus' crew mourns dead by Cyclops]; to the θρῆνος, *Il.* 24.722 [women's response to θρῆνος], cf. στοναχέειν *Il.* 18.124 [Trojan women mourn Achilles' return to war]). Even when the leader does not explicitly lament, the group mourning of στεναχέσθαι is still centered around him: ἀμφ' Ἀχιλῆα / Μυρμιδόνες Πάτροκλον ἀνεστενάχοντο γόωντες (*Il.* 18.354-5). στένειν is likewise a form of accompaniment for other mourners, but marked in each case by the distance of the mourner from the immediate mourning group (*Il.* 18.32-4 [Achilles for Patroclus], 24.776 [δῆμος response to Helen's lament]).

[47] μύρεσθαι is a verb connected exclusively with group mourning for the dead, most often in the presence of the corpse or during ritual handling of the body (*Il.* 18.233-4 [Achilles and companions for Patroclus], 19.212-3 [Achilles' ἑταῖροι for Patroclus], 23.13-4, 109-110 [Achilles and companions for Patroclus], 24.793-6 [siblings and ἑταῖροι for Patroclus]). It also often appears in connection with κλαίειν in contexts that suggest that it signifies the whole process of interchange between members of the mourning group or between the leading mourner and his group, as for example with the alternation of κλαίειν with στεναχέσθαι at *Il.* 19.3338–340 [Achilles for Patroclus]: ὡς ἔφατο κλαίων, ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γέροντες... μυρομένους δ' ἄρα τούς γε ἰδὼν ἐλέησε Κρονίων (cf. *Il.* 17.437-441 [horses at Patroclus' death], 19.4-6 [Achilles' ἑταῖροι for Patroclus], 22.427 [Hector's parents], *Od.* 10.201-2, 566-9 [Odysseus' crew]).

κλαίειν can preface direct speech[48], but more often appears as a participle combined with verbs denoting direct speech or lament, suggesting that κλαίειν refers to 'spontaneous' lament as an accompanying action rather than as a speech genre of mourning.[49] κλαίειν is a markedly collective activity; apart from a few informal individual laments, it designates primarily non-verbalized mourning performed by groups and verbalized or non-verbalized mourning performed by individuals in collective contexts with group response.[50] Together with the process of burning and burial, κλαίειν represents a central part of the deceased's transitional process and of the γέρας θανόντων provided him by the group to which he belongs.[51] The action of mourning is directed by an authority figure who controls the decision to begin or to cease mourning[52]: οὐδ' εἴα κλαίειν Πρίαμος μέγας, οἱ δὲ σιωπῇ... (*Il.* 7.427). While the group significance of κλαίειν is connected with the conventional duties of the living to the dead, the individual κλαυθμός takes on a further dynamic of communication between the mourner(s) and the dead and between the mourner(s) and their group by association with distinctive sequences of conventional gestures.

κλαίειν appears as a part of two larger sequences of externally visible reaction to death.[53] The male sequence begins with memory of the dead[54], followed by mourning (κλαίειν) with στενάχειν as the group

---

[48] *Il.* 19.286 [Briseis for Patroclus].

[49] *Il.* 22.430 γόοιο, 437 κλαίουσ' [Hecabe for Hector]; 22.476 γοόωσα, 515 κλαίουσ' [Andromache for Hector]; 23.9 κλαίωμεν, 14 γόου, 17 γόοιο [Achilles for Patroclus]; 24.723 γόοιο, 746 κλαίουσ(α) (= 24.747, 760, 761, 776 [laments of Andromache, Hecabe, and Helen for Hector]).

[50] The exception is Achilles mourning for Patroclus: *Il.* 18.67ff., 24.3ff.

[51] *Il.* 23.11 [Patroclus], *Od.* 4.197 [Peisistratus on death ritual]; on the lack of mourning and / or burial as a crisis situation which must be resolved, see *Il.* 22.386-7 [Patroclus], *Od.* 11.54, 72 [Elpenor].

[52] *Il.* 18.338-342 [Trojan women forced to mourn for Patroclus], 19.295-7 [Patroclus prevents Briseis from weeping at death of her father], *Od.* 4.805-7 [gods don't allow Penelope's mourning], 9.468-9 [Odysseus prevents crew from mourning comrades killed by Cyclops].

[53] τέκνον, τί κλαίεις; τί δέ σε φρένας ἵκετο πένθος; / ἐξαύδα, μὴ κεῦθε. *Il.* 18.73-4 [Thetis]; τῶ σέ θ' ἅμα κλαίω καὶ ἔμ' ἄμμορον ἀχνυμένη κῆρ, *Il.* 24.773 [Helen]; cf. *Il.* 17.426 [horses for Patroclus], *Od.* 8.577 [Odysseus at bard's song], 20.83-4 [Penelope for Odysseus].

[54] μνησάμενος *Il.* 19.314, 24.4 [Achilles for Patroclus], 509 [Priam for Hector, Achilles for Patroclus], cf. memory of a group with κλαίειν, *Od.* 10.198-201 [crew remembering the Laistrygonians and the Cyclops], 11.71-2 [Elpenor], 12.309 [crew remembering those killed by Scylla]. Rosenblatt et al. 48 discusses the function of psychological 'cues' in the environment of the mourner which inspire memory and therefore mourning for the deceased (e.g. a favorite possession or a habitual behavioral pattern interrupted or complicated by the departure of the deceased). κλαίειν also seems to be connected with psychological 'cues' reminding the mourner of the deceased, as for example the bow of Odysseus (*Od.* 21.55-6, 83) or the speech of Menelaus recalling Odysseus (κλαῖε μέν.. κλαῖε δέ, *Od.* 4.183-5).

response, much like a ritual γόος.[55] The female sequence begins with the woman's sight of the dead, followed by a cry and an embrace or other handling of the corpse[56]; afterwards the mourner may deface her skin or upper body while mourning the dead:

> Βρισηῒς δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτ', ἰκέλη χρυσέῃ 'Αφροδίτῃ,
> ὡς ἴδε Πάτροκλον δεδαϊγμένον ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ,
> ἀμφ' αὐτῷ χυμένη λίγ' ἐκώκυε, χερσὶ δ' ἄμυσσε
> στήθεά τ' ἠδ' ἁπαλὴν δειρὴν ἰδὲ καλὰ πρόσωπα (*Il.* 19.282-5).

[55] *Il.* 19.6 [Achilles for Patroclus], 338 [Achilles and elders for Patroclus], 22.427-31 [Hector's parents], 24.510-2 [Achilles and Priam].

[56] κωκύειν is a woman's cry at the recognition of the death of kin, sometimes at aural (*Il.* 18.35-8 [Thetis]) but usually at visual recognition of the deceased or the fact of death (ἴδε *Il.* 18.283 [Briseis]; ἐσιδοῦσα, 22.407 [Hecabe]; ἴδε 24.703 [Cassandra], ἰδοῦσα *Od.* 8.526-7 [a woman and her dead husband as a simile for Odysseus crying at the bard's song], cf. Penelope's dream of the death of the geese, *Od.* 19.535-543). Like κλαίειν, it is often characterized as λιγύς: *Il.* 18.284 [Briseis], *Od.* 4.259 [Trojan women at presence of Odysseus], 8.527 [woman for husband]); this piercing cry has a special ritual position, prefacing extended laments by bringing together the mourners (*Il.* 18.35-8 [Thetis], 24.703-6 [Cassandra], *Od.* 19.541-3 [Penelope]) and by initiating significant ritual gestures of self-injury (*Il.* 18.284-5 [Briseis]), or clasping of the head (*Il.* 18.71 [Thetis and Achilles]) or body (*Il.* 18.284 [Briseis], *Od.* 8.527 [woman and her dead husband]) of the person deceased or anticipated deceased. In some circumstances, κωκύειν also marks the anticipation of death (*Il.* 18.35-8 [Thetis and Achilles], 24.200 [Hecabe at Priam leaving to meet Achilles], *Od.* 2.361 [Eurycleia at Telemachus' plan to search for his father]).

The corresponding male response is οἰμωγή, which is an immediate, individual cry in reaction to others' danger or death: *Il.* 10.519-522 [Hippocoon], 18.35 [Achilles for Patroclus], 22.33-5 [Priam for living Hector], 408-9 [Trojans for Hector], cf. Elpenor's οἰμωγή at relating his own death, *Od.* 11.59; much like κωκυτός, οἰμωγή can be connected with a visual impression (ἴδε[ν], *Il.* 10.520 [Hippocoon], 22.25 [Priam for Hector]) and a reaction of other mourners, as in Thetis' reaction of κωκυτός and γόος in response to Achilles' οἰμωγή (*Il.* 18.35) or Andromache's recognition of Hector's death through the οἰμωγή and κωκυτός in the city (*Il.* 22.447ff.). Both individual (*Il.* 23.178, 24.591 [Achilles for Patroclus]) and collective (*Il.* 23.12 [Achilles and companions for Patroclus], 24.696-7 [Trojans for Hector]) οἰμωγή accompany large-scale ritual activity, such the transportation of the corpse and the burning of the body on the pyre. οἰμωγή also marks life-threatening crises and is often combined with the slapping of the thighs discussed by Lowenstam (e.g. *Il.* 12.162 [Asius], 15.395-8 [Patroclus]), or with the onset of death itself (*Il.* 5.68 [Phereclus], 16.289-290 [Pyraichmes], 20.417-8 [Polydorus]); it thus appears in particular as the inverse of the victor's εὐχωλή in a martial encounter (*Il.* 4.450, 8.64-5). The analogical position of κωκυτός and οἰμωγή as female and male cries becomes clear at *Il.* 22.407-9, where Hecabe's cry is denoted with κωκύειν, Priam's with ᾤμωξεν, and the response from the people in general is described as commingled κωκυτός and οἰμωγή: [ἡ μήτηρ]... κώκυσεν δὲ μάλα μέγα παῖδ' ἐσιδοῦσα. / ᾤμωξεν δ' ἐλεεινὰ πατὴρ φίλος, ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοί / κωκυτῷ τ' εἴχοντο καὶ οἰμωγῇ κατὰ ἄστυ (cf. the same pair at *Il.* 22.447). Cf. Arnould 150-5 on the opposition between the female (ὀξύ, λιγύ) κωκύειν and the homologous male οἰμωγή and (βαρύ) στενάχειν, which indicate not only gender but also register of sound: with its onomatopoetic κ-reduplication, κωκύειν suggests a piercing (ὀξύ) or high and modulated (λιγύ) repetitive sound as opposed to στενάχειν, which implies resonant sound associated with the physical weight of grief.

For both genders, κλαυθμός is associated with the individual's clasping the body of the deceased, the emission of shrill, nonverbalized sounds, and / or the response of another individual or group with στενάχειν or μύρεσθαι.[57] The disfiguring of the mourner's appearance is central to the nature of κλαυθμός as individual mourning and as identification with the deceased[58]: for men, it involves a seated posture, often on the ground[59], while for women, it involves the disfiguring of the upper body or the defacing of the skin, and may also include a seated posture.[60] For both men and women, κλαίειν involves the shedding of tears[61], an action which is also understood as the necessary transformation and disfigurement of the mourner's appearance:

> ...αὐτὰρ 'Οδυσσεὺς
> τήκετο, δάκρυ δ' ἔδευεν ὑπὸ βλεφάροισι παρειάς.
> ὡς δὲ γυνὴ κλαίῃσι φίλον πόσιν ἀμφιπεσοῦσα (*Od.* 8.521-3).

Here, mourning is performed by both men and women in slightly different but often analogous conventions; what distinguishes κλαυθμός is that it represents the women's sole possibility of physical expression during mourning, through marcation of her own body, in contrast to the multiple alternatives available to the male mourner, ranging from self-disfigurement to large-scale ritual activities such as the cremation of the corpse

---

[57] *Il.* 19.6 [Achilles for Patroclus, response of companions], 22.427 [Priam and Hecabe for Hector], *Od.* 10.202 [Odysseus' crew].

[58] On self-disfigurement as a signal of the mourner's identification with the deceased, see F. Ferrari, 'Dizione epica e pianto rituale (*Iliade* 22, 405-436),' *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 12 (1984): 257-265, especially 257-260. The dirt on the mourner's body and the tearing of hair or garments forms an analogy to the nakedness and dirtying of the dead warrior's body and the trailing of his hair on the ground. Mourning as such is homeopathic – the actions of mourning correspond to the disfigurement of the warrior on the battlefield. This homeopathy between mourner and warrior has already been discussed by Charles Segal, 'Andromache's Anagnorisis: Formulaic Artistry in *Iliad* 22.437-476,' *HSCP* 75 (1971): 33-57.

[59] *Il.* 24.515 [Achilles for Patroclus], *Od.* 4.539 [Menelaus for Agamemnon], 5.82 [Odysseus on Kalypso's island], 10.497 [Odysseus' reaction to necessary trip to Hades]. See Jan Bremmer, 'Walking, standing, and sitting in ancient Greek culture,' in Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg, eds., *A Cultural History of Gesture* (Cambridge, 1991): 15-35, esp. 25-6 on the passive aspect of the seated male in ancient Greece, a posture associated also with beggars and suppliants. For some cross-cultural parallels, see M. I. Gruber, *Aspects of Nonverbal Communication in the Ancient Near East* (Rome, 1980) on similar postures in the Hebrew tradition.

[60] On the disfigurement of the mourner's appearance, see *Il.* 19.285 (Briseis), *Od.* 2.376, 4.749 (Penelope); for the mourner's seated posture, see *Od.* 20.58, 21.55 (Penelope)

[61] *Od.* 5.83-4 [Odysseus on Kalypso's island], 10.201 [Odysseus' crew], 19.204-9 [Penelope]; cf. Monsacré 171 on the connection of κλαίειν and δάκρυα.

and the construction of the σῆμα. Thus, as we shall see after considering the ritual γόος below, both women's physical and verbal communication in mourning are limited to isolated and immediate activities without long-term effects comparable to those of male mourning. Although the patterns of male and female mourning differ in these respects, the function of κλαυθμός remains constant for both genders in the conventional verbal and gestural communication with the dead and among the mourners, followed by the response of the group.

κλαίειν is closely associated with the performance of the γόος, which usually concludes with the closing formula ὣς ἔφατο κλαίουσ' (e.g. *Il.* 24.776). The distinction between the two forms of lament lies in the significance of κλαυθμός as mourning that can occur in a private, informal or individual situation, yet can also accompany the fulfillment of ritual duties to the dead, including the γόος, which forms the central verbal part of the funerary ritual. The mention of desire for γόος and the satisfaction of this desire often frames the action of κλαίειν which is not apparently situated within the death ritual:

> ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς ἵπποισι καὶ ἅρμασιν ἆσσον ἰόντες
> Πάτροκλον κλαίωμεν. ὃ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων.
> αὐτὰρ ἐπεί κ' ὀλοοῖο τεταρπώμεσθα γόοιο,
> ἵππους λυσάμενοι δορπήσομεν ἐνθάδε πάντες (*Il.* 23.8-11[62]).

Thus, both κλαυθμός and γόος can be seen as constituents of mourning and as essential processes in the transition of the deceased, but with different levels of ritual formality and proximity to the closure of the mourning process. While both κλαυθμός and γόος are associated with the funerary procedure, κλαυθμός can also occur in more informal contexts and with smaller groups. κλαυθμός can satisfy the desire for γόος by functioning as a microcosm of the γόος within informal or domestic settings or in situations where non-kin perform laments, as for example in Briseis' lament for Patroclus at *Il.* 19.287-300. Indeed, as I will show below, laments prefaced by the informal κλαίειν and the ritually marked γοᾶν reveal multiple common themes and structural motifs; the two genres thus differ more according to performance context and ritual function than narrative content. An individual's speech or γόος paired with κλαυθμός is answered

[62] cf. *Od.* 4.183-5 [Menelaus, Helen, and Telemachus mourn Odysseus], 800-1 [Penelope for Odysseus] and 17.7-9 [Penelope] with their juxtaposition of κλαυθμός and γόος, and the κλαίειν / στενάχειν pairing at the end of γόοι and other unmarked mourning speeches.

with στενάχειν; this pairing κλαίειν / στενάχειν often suggests a context in which the individual mourners within a group commemorate the immediately present deceased together with their own losses: ὣς ἔφατο κλαίων, ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γέροντες, / μνησάμενοι τὰ ἕκαστος ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔλειπεν (*Il.* 19.338-9).[63] This ability of the κλαυθμός to accommodate mourning for personal concerns within the mourning for another deceased underscores the informal, communicative, and 'spontaneous' nature of this mode of mourning; its constant state of communication between mourner and group and between mourner and dead makes κλαυθμός essential to, yet open-ended and thus distinct from, the ritual expression of the γόος.

1.2 *The Ritual Lament (γόος)*

With the spectrum ὀδύρεσθαι-ἄχνυσθαι-κλαίειν-γόος, Homeric mourning encompasses a spectrum of behavior from individual and collective grief to 'spontaneous' and ritually conditioned lament. The two genres of formally performed ritual lament are the θρῆνος and the γόος: as Alexiou has already noted, the θρῆνος is a professional lament performed in public by non-kin specialists, while the γόος is a private genre[64] performed by individuals among relatives or close friends, but often also in a larger public context. In the close readings of the Homeric γόοι, I will isolate the thematic, structural and performative conventions of the ritual lament within the epic narrative and its relationship to other media, ranging from private mourning to the σῆμα and the epic itself. The γόος occupies an ambiguous position within the epic narrative. Although ritual lament represents one of

[63] Cf. *Il.* 19.301-2 [women mourn their own cares with Patroclus' death as pretense], 24.509-512 [Achilles and Priam mourn together for different dead], *Od.* 4.186-9 [Peisistratus mourns Antilochos as others mourn Odysseus].

[64] Alexiou's purely speculative view is that both terms once indicated lament in general (102-3), but that the distinction between private and professional performance was isolated in Homeric and archaic contexts; judging from the otherwise well-differentiated terms for mourning and lament in our earliest evidence in the Homeric poems, this original interchangeability between the terms seems highly unlikely. The θρῆνος appears twice in the Homeric corpus, both in contexts suggesting professional song performed by non-kin (hired singers at *Il.* 24.720-2 and the Muses at *Od.* 24.60-1), each time with some kind of antiphony (στενάχοντο *Il.* 24.722, ἀμειβόμεναι *Od.* 24.60); interestingly, the θρῆνος is never cited in the epic text, a feature which perhaps indicates its special status as professional song (Nagy *Best of the Achaeans* 112). Cf. also Proclus' summary of the *Aithiopis* (p. 106.13-14 Allen), where Thetis with the Muses θρηνεῖ τὸν παῖδα, probably a confusion of genre restricted to the summary and not present in the Homeric text (Nagy, *Best of the Achaeans* 172 and n.). On professional lament in the Greek tradition, see N. Richardson, *The Iliad: A Commentary Vol. VI: books 21-24* (Cambridge, 1993): 351-2.

the few genres of female song or memory, it also functions as the female complement to the heroic action of the living warrior and as the marker of death as the end of the hero's opportunities to attain κλέος[65]; as I will show below, the lament thus becomes the linguistic and generic inverse of heroic κλέος in the larger frame narrative of the epic. Despite this functional subordination to heroic male strategies of memorialization, lament retains a crucial position as the complement to heroic activity and as a central element of the protagonist's crisis in the Homeric epics as we have them. As part of the referential tradition with which historical memorials likewise engage, the Homeric representation of lament provides evidence both for ongoing tensions between different media of mourning, as well as for a thematic and structural model against which the inscribed grave epigram will define its own function and authority as written text.

The γόος lament appears uncited in informal formats and cited in ritual contexts. As discussed above, the informal γόος is much like κλαυθμός in its informal, 'spontaneous' function as a private substitute for the formal expression of the ritual γόος. In the informal γόος, the mourners satisfy their desire for γόος in an often domestic setting where the direct speech, the formal ritual activity, and the leader-group configuration marking the ritual γόος are lacking.[66] The desire for informal γόος is raised by a gesture of embrace or by speech that recalls the deceased or one expected to be dead[67]; the speech that stimulates γόος often highlights the crisis situation connected with the mourning, such as the appearance of Patroclus' ghost to ask for burial or the prolonged disappearance of Odysseus. The mourner's activity is described by the term γόος together with various other verbs of mourning, such as ὀδύρεσθαι, κλαίειν, or στενάχειν[68], and

---

[65] See Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans* 97 on the use of the term κλέος in hexametric poetry to designate the epic tradition itself: Hes. *Th.* 100 (epic bard), *Od.* 1.338, 351-2 (Phemius), 8.73-4 (Demodocus).

[66] *Il.* 23.97-8 [Achilles and Patroclus' ghost], 152-9 [Achilles and companions for Patroclus], 24.226-7 [Priam for Hector]; *Od.* 4.100-3 [Menelaus], 183 [Menelaus, Helen, Telemachus], 799-801 [Penelope], 11.212 [Odysseus with mother's shade], 19.118-120 [Odysseus], 208-213, 249-252, 513-4, 21.55-7 [Penelope].

[67] γόος paired with or in response to the gesture of embrace (*Il.* 23.97-8 [Achilles and Patroclus' ghost], 24.226-7 [Priam and Hector]; *Od.* 11.211-2 [Odysseus and his mother's shade], 16.214-5 [reunion of Odysseus and Telemachus]) and in response to speech: *Il.* 23.105-8 [Achilles and Achaeans], 152-3 [Achilles and companions for Patroclus], 24.507 [Priam and Achilles], *Od.* 4.113 [Menelaus and Telemachus], 17.41-7 [Penelope and Telemachus], 19.249 [Penelope and Odysseus]. On the desire for γόος, see Monsacré 193.

[68] ὀδύρεσθαι (*Il.* 23.153-4 [Achilles and companions for Patroclus], *Od.* 4.100 [Menelaus], 800 [Penelope], 19.213, 251 [Penelope]), κλαίειν (*Il.* 24.511 [Achilles and Priam], *Od.* 4.184-5 [Menelaus, Helen, Telemachus], 801 [Penelope], 19.208-210, 21.56 [Penelope]), στενάχειν (*Il.* 24.512 [Priam and Achilles]).

often ends with τέρπεσθαι[69], suggesting the satisfaction of the desire for γόος:

> ὣς φάτο, τῷ δ' ἄρα πατρὸς ὑφ' ἵμερον ὦρσε γόοιο...
> αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς κλαῖεν ἑὸν πατέρ', ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
> Πάτροκλον. τῶν δὲ στοναχὴ κατὰ δώματ' ὀρώρει.
> αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥα γόοιο τετάρπετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς... (*Il.* 24.507-513).

In both informal and ritual forms, the γόος has a strong association with the question of a warrior's return from battle – the loss of homecoming is equated with death and γόος, both in the *Iliad*'s battlefield contexts and in the *Odyssey*'s engagement with νόστος.[70] The informal γόος is put to a stop by the warrior's revenge for a death or by the assurance of the hero's homecoming and the security of his household[71]; in a similar usage, the soul is imagined as γοόωσα at its departure from the body[72], perhaps associating the separation of soul and body with this theme of departure and loss of homecoming associated with the γόος.

As seen above, γοᾶν and γόος encompass various ritual and nonritual, verbalized and non-verbalized types of lament[73], of which the former are the only consistently generically marked and cited formal laments in the Homeric corpus. In the cited formal ritual γόος, a female relative of the deceased initiates and leads the lament of a same-sex group within a domestic or a public setting.[74] There are eight γόοι quoted in direct speech

---

[69] *Od.* 4.102 [Menelaus], 194 [Peisistratus], 11.212 [Odysseus and his mother's shade], 19.213, 251, 513, 21.57 [Penelope]; cf. also ἆσαι (*Il.* 23.157 [Achilles]), and κόρος (κόρος κρυεροῖο γόοιο, *Od.* 4.103 [Menelaus]).

[70] *Il.* 5.156-8 (Diomedes kills twin sons of Phainops): πατέρι δὲ γόον καὶ κήδεα λυγρὰ / λεῖπ', ἐπεὶ οὐ ζώοντε μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντε δέξατο...; 6.500-2 (mourning for Hector while still alive): αἱ μὲν ἔτι ζωὸν γόον Ἕκτορα ᾧ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ. / οὐ γάρ μιν ἔτ' ἔφαντο ὑπότροπον ἐκ πολέμοιο / ἵξεσθαι... ; *Od.* 1.242-3 (Telemachus on Odysseus): οἴχετ' ἄϊστος, ἄπυστος, ἐμοὶ δ' ὀδύνας τε γόους τε / κάλλιπεν; cf. scenes in the *Od.* where the homecoming of the crew is endangered and they respond with γόοι or other mourning, e.g. *Od.* 10.198-209, 241-8, 453-7 [Circe's island], 12.234 [Scylla and Charybdis]).

[71] *Il.* 17.38-42 [Euphorbus on his brother's widow], *Od.* 4.754-758, 799-807, 17.6-9, 19.262-273 [Penelope], 24.321-6 [Laertes].

[72] *Il.* 16.855-7, 23.106 [Patroclus].

[73] *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* s.v. γόος .

[74] Uncited laments of kin or close friends for their dead also abound, many of which share characteristics with the γόοι performed within the framework of death ritual: *Il.* 5.156-7 [Phainops for his twin sons], 412-6 [Diomedes' wife], 6.497-502 [Andromache and her servants for Hector], 14. 501-2 [parents of Ilioneus], 17.36-8 [Euphorbus' brother's widow], 18.314-7 [Achaeans for Patroclus], 354-5 [Myrmidons for Patroclus], 21.123-4 [Achilles on Lycaon's mother], 22.352-3 [Achilles on Hector's mother], 24.160-3 [Priam's family], 741 [Andromache on Hector's parents]; *Od.* 10.456-7 [Odysseus' crew for their dead], 17.6-9 [Penelope for Telemachus], 24.188-190 [suitors]. The single male per-

in the Homeric corpus: Thetis mourning for Achilles (*Il.* 18.51ff.), Hecabe for Hector (*Il.* 22.430-6), Andromache for Hector (*Il.* 22.477ff.), Achilles for Patroclus (*Il.* 23.19-23), Andromache for Hector (*Il.* 24.723-745), Hecabe for Hector (*Il.* 24.748-759), Helen for Hector (*Il.* 24.762)[75], and Penelope for the absent Odysseus and Telemachus (*Od.* 4.721-741).[76] Each ritual lament is viewed as part of the γέρας θανόντων (*Od.* 24.188-190) and often immediately precedes the ritual processing of the body, which includes the burning of the pyre, the funeral feast, and the erection of the burial mound:

> ἐννῆμαρ μέν κ' αὐτὸν ἐνὶ μεγάροις γοάοιμεν,
> τῇ δεκάτῃ δέ κε θάπτοιμεν δαινῦτό τε λαός,
> ἐνδεκάτῃ δέ κε τύμβον ἐπ' αὐτῷ ποιήσαιμεν... (*Il.* 24.665-7).

The two γόοι for heroes who are still living (Thetis for Achilles, *Il.* 18.52-64, Penelope for Odysseus and Telemachus, *Od.* 4.722-741), share various

former of a cited γόος – and an unusual one, to be discussed below – is Achilles (*Il.* 23.19-23).

[75] Monsacré 119-121, 158-9 attempts to claim a special status for the γόος of Helen because it is the last one in the *Iliad* and because it reflects Helen's communicative autonomy in that she laments without reference to a close male relative or husband. This argument according to position within the poem is only verifiable if we think of a planned or traditional composition of the *Iliad*, in which Helen's lament is necessarily the 'final word.' Secondly, Helen's γόος is hardly spoken in 'autonomie de sentiments' (159), but reflects traits of Briseis' lament for Patroclus – both women are indirectly related to the deceased through partnership with an intimate friend or relative and both make mention of the deceased's kindness (*Il.* 19.295-300, 24.767-775). Helen's expression of guilt for the war, characterized without comparanda by Monsacré as a 'male' feature, and her lament for herself (cf. Andromache's paralleling Hector's and her own fates, *Il.* 22. 477-484) are no indication of her autonomy from the thematic conventions of women's lament.

[76] There exist other mourning speeches not labeled as γόοι which include various features of the γόοι; they are laments marked by κλαίειν and / or στενάχειν with an address of the deceased in a group context: Briseis for Patroclus (*Il.* 19.287-300), Achilles for Patroclus (*Il.* 18.323-342, 19.313-338), and Priam for Hector (*Il.* 22.416-429). I will use these four unmarked laments to ***supplement*** my development of a model for the Homeric lament, while recognizing their exceptional nature, in that 1) all four unlabeled laments take place outside the ritual context of a funeral; 2) Briseis is not a relative of Patroclus by blood or marriage; 3) Achilles' laments, including his labeled γόος, are exceptional – they are marked by threatening content and differentiated from the others by heroic speech of remembrance and exclusively individual male lament. The first lament (*Il.* 18.323-342) is prefaced βαρὺ στενάχων (323), a marker of individual male mourning; Achilles' second lament for Patroclus begins μνησάμενος (*Il.* 19.314) with the response μνησάμενοι (19.338), cf. Martin 77ff. on acts of memory as the domain of heroes and bards, and 86-7 on the status of Achilles as the best heroic speaker and performer of lament, a genre of remembrance which ultimately 'unites Achilles in thought with Priam and effects the closure of the *Iliad*' (87). More on the exceptional status of Achilles' laments will follow below.

formal features that distinguish them from the γόοι for the dead, yet retain structural and thematic affinities to the other labeled γόοι, revealing a relatively consistent structure.

1.2.1 *The Performance and Structure of γόοι*

The performance of the γόος is most often set in an indoor situation[77] among kin or intimates of the deceased; portrayals of γόοι emphasize the house or other dwelling as the location of the lament for persons either dead or expected dead[78] and sometimes make explicit mention of domestic affairs that form a complex with the γόος – property division (*Il.* 5.155-8), questions of the perusal of wealth (*Od.* 1.242-8) or the condition of the οἶκος (*Od.* 16.144). Priam's dismissal of Hector's non-kin mourners and Odysseus' negative assessment of his γόος in a stranger's house underscore the difference between private γόος determined by kinship or close relationship and other types of public, communal mourning:

> ἔρρετε, λωβητῆρες ἐλεγχέες. οὔ νυ καὶ ὑμῖν
> οἴκοι ἔνεστι γόος, ὅτι μ' ἤλθετε κηδήσοντες; (*Il.* 24.239-240)

> ...οὐδέ τί με χρὴ
> οἴκῳ ἐν αλλοτρίῳ γοόωντά τε μυρόμενόν τε
> ἧσθαι, ἐπεὶ κάκιον πενθήμεναι ἄκριτον αἰεί... (*Od.* 19.118-120[79]).

Even when there is no quoted *performance* of a γόος but the mention of *desire* for γόος, the context remains familial; speech, gestures, or other ritual activities carried out by the next of kin generate the desire for γόος.[80]

Before beginning the γόος, the leading mourner is positioned among a same-sex group and may be involved in ritual activity involving her own upper body or that of the deceased.[81] The γόοι are prefaced by a formally

---

[77] Monsacré 182; *Il.* 18.50 [Thetis], 19.288-290 [Briseis], 24.719-720 [Hector]; *Od.* 4.718 [Penelope].

[78] *Il.* 5.412-415 [Diomedes' wife]; 6.499ff. [Andromache and her maidservants]; 17.34-42 [Euphorbus' brother's widow]; 24.160 [Priam's family], 239-240 [Trojans], 512-3 [Priam and Achilles], 665 [Trojans for Hector]; *Od.* 4.101-3 [Menelaus]; 19.513-4 [Penelope].

[79] Monsacré 146-7 notes that this passage underlines the internalized weeping of Odysseus – i.e. he restrains exterior tears within the 'strange' house of his wife, while weeping, as women do with the formal γόος – in a familiar interior, psychologically speaking. On the limitation of mourning and ritual action to close relations (κηδεμόνες) of the deceased, cf. *Il.* 23.158-165 [Achilles to Agamemnon].

[80] funerary activities: *Il.* 23.10-4, 152-3, 157-8 [Achilles for Patroclus]; embrace: *Il.* 23.97-8 [Achilles and Patroclus' ghost], 24.227 [Priam and Hector], *Od.* 11.211-2 [Odysseus and his mother], 16.214-5 [reunion of Odysseus and Telemachus].

[81] These gestures include the female mourner's beating of her chest (*Il.* 18.51 [Thetis], 19.284-5 [Briseis]), neck (*Il.* 19.284-5 [Briseis]), or face (*Il.* 19.284-5 [Briseis]); the male

marked beginning of performance: [ἀμβλήδην / ἀδινὸν] γοόωσα[82] or (ἐξ)ῆρχε γόοιο[83] and usually begin with an direct address to the dead.[84] Following the address of the deceased or fellow mourners, the mourner turns to herself and to her relationship with the deceased, normally beginning with an exclamation of misfortune (δειλή, δυσάμμορος, δύστηνος) modifying an explicit ἐγώ.[85] The mourner begins her narration with the birth of the deceased, her own offspring, or herself.[86] She situates both the deceased and herself within their kinship[87] and social[88] groups, underlining the importance of the deceased within these groups and the particular relationship between mourner and mourned within these groups. After the past social position of the deceased is sketched out by the lament, the mourner arrives at the point of the hero's death; here, she draws a contrast between the deceased and herself, paralleled by a contrast between the past in which the deceased was still alive and the present in which he is dead, often marked with νῦν. The interconnected descriptions of the deceased and the mourner(s) are characteristically shaped by frequent relative clauses, which mediate the chronological gap between the past life, the present death, and the future fate of the survivors; these relative clauses also link the present and future fate of mourner and mourned to their common past – the birth of the deceased (*Il.* 18.55), the birth or past life of his son[89], the life of the deceased[90], and the past[91] and future[92] life of the mourner. This mediation of the chronological upset of death underlies the

---

mourner's touching the chest of the deceased (*Il.* 18.317, 23.18 [Achilles for Patroclus]), and the female mourner's holding of the head of the deceased (*Il.* 24.724 [Andromache]).

[82] *Il.* 22.476 [Andromache], *Od.* 4.721 [Penelope].

[83] *Il.* 18.316, 23.17 [Achilles for Patroclus], 24.723 [Andromache for Hector], 747 [Hecabe for Hector], 761 [Helen for Hector].

[84] *Il.* 19.287 [Briseis], 315 [Achilles for Patroclus, with σύ], 22.431 [Hecabe], 477 [Andromache], 23.19 [Achilles], 24.725 [Andromache], 748 [Hecabe].

[85] *Il.* 18.54 [Thetis], 19.288 [Briseis], 22.431 [Hecabe], 477 [Andromache], 24.727 [Andromache], 749 [Hecabe], cf. also μοι in a similar function: *Il.* 19.315, 23.19 [Achilles], *Od.* 4.722 [Penelope]. An interesting parallel is *Od.* 5.299, where Odysseus is caught in a storm at sea; his address of his θυμός (ὤ μοι ἐγὼ δειλός· τί νύ μοι μήκιστα γένηται;) parallels the introduction of γόοι and thus marks it as an anticipation of death.

[86] *Il.* 18.54-60 [Thetis], 22.431 [Hecabe], 22.477-481, 484-5, 24.727-8 [Andromache], 748-753 [Hecabe]; *Od.* 4.723 [Penelope].

[87] *Il.* 18.55, 60 [Thetis], 22.431 [Hecabe], 477-480, 24.725 [Andromache], 748 [Hecabe], 762-4 [Helen]; *Od.* 4.724 [Penelope].

[88] *Il.* 22.432-6 [Hecabe], 507, 24.729-730 [Andromache], 764, 774-5; *Od.* 4.725-6.

[89] *Il.* 22.485, 500, 506; 24.727 [Andromache].

[90] *Il.* 22.431, 434 [Hecabe]; 24.729, 736 [Andromache].

[91] childhood: *Il.* 22.480 [Andromache]; marriage: *Il.* 24.764, 766 [Helen], *Od.* 4.736 [Penelope]; loss of other relatives: *Od.* 4.724 [Penelope].

[92] *Il.* 24.731, 744-5 [Andromache].

various themes that are common to the γόοι: the alternation of day and night[93], the life cycles of the hero, or the unfulfilled wish for a different outcome in life or in death.[94] Through this contrast of past, present and future, the former status of the deceased in his social group comes into dissolution and is finally resolved by the mourner's depiction of her future with the deceased as stable dead; the conclusion of the γόος anticipates the future of the hero's wife, child, household and polis in his absence.[95] The mourners respond with nonverbalized mourning ὣς ἔφατο κλαίουσ', ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες[96]; ritual activity then follows the γόος.

In the γόοι of Thetis and Penelope, where the subject is still living, the lament is in the third person instead of the usual second person and addresses the mourners instead of the dead (κλῦτε, *Il.* 18.52, *Od.* 4.722). These γόοι share the themes and chronological sequences of the other γόοι for deceased heroes, yet come to a different conclusion, breaking off with ἀλλά to introduce a plan of action to either embrace or ward off the oncoming death.[97] In contrast to the other γόοι, whose diction and composition are limited to the individual performance, as we shall see below, the γόοι for those still living include diction that appears wholly unchanged in other unmarked contexts outside lament[98]; as an address of third persons, these γόοι are, even if thematically limited to the immediate crisis of the hero, not limited to a unique performance as is the γόος addressed to the dead in the singular moment of death ritual. In the absence of a ritual context and in the interruption of these γόοι for action, the accompanying group does not respond to these γόοι with additional mourning.

---

93 The theme of alternation between day and night (*Il.* 22.432 [Hecabe], 24.744-5 [Andromache]) parallels the ongoing glory of the hero in life (ὅ μοι νύκτας τε καὶ ἦμαρ / εὐχωλὴ κατὰ ἄστυ πελέσκεο, *Il.* 22.432-3) with the lament that continues over several days (cf. the formula νύκτας τε καὶ ἦμαρ/-ατα, *Il.* 18.340 [Trojan women for Patroclus], 24.745 [Andromache], *Od.* 11.183 [Odysseus' mother], 24.63 [Achilles' funeral]). See S. Humphreys, 'Death and Time,' in *The Family, Women, and Death* (London, 1983) 148-168 on the Greek evidence for the role of time in death: the 'correct' time to die, the time of dying and the moment of death, and the question of time in the afterlife.

94 *Il.* 22.481 [Andromache], 24.764 [Helen]. See Alexiou 161-182 on these recurring themes in Homeric lament.

95 *Il.* 22.483-500, 24.728-742, 745 [Andromache].

96 *Il.* 22.515, 24.746 [Andromache], 760 [Hecabe], 776 [Helen].

97 See Arnould 188-9 on forms of mourning beyond those performed within the epic text: implicit mourning (e.g. the implied performance of lament for Achilles, not depicted in the text) and anticipatory mourning, as in the γόοι of Thetis and Penelope, as well as other informal laments for Hector (*Il.* 6.500 [Andromache and her maidservants]) and Odysseus (*Od.* 19.208-210 [Penelope]) performed while the hero is endangered but still living.

98 *Il.* 18.429ff. [Thetis], *Od.* 4.810ff [Penelope].

A central part of the transition following the hero-husband's death is the question of the son's accession to the status of his father. True to their place in the heroic system, the γόοι can assume a doublet version, in which father and son are lamented together in a single γόος.[99] For example, Andromache's γόος at *Il.* 22.477ff. is structured as follows:

1)	general statement of misfortune of father and mother (22.477-8)
2)	the common past of husband and wife (22.478-481)
3)	the present death of the father and its repercussions for the family (marked by νῦν, 22.482-5)
4)	future of father and son as interdependent (22.485-6)
5)	future of son (22.487-9)
1a)	general statement of misfortune of an orphaned son (22.490)
5a/4a)	the future of the son without a father (22.491-9)
2a)	the common past of father and son (22.500-4)
3a)	the present separation of father and son (marked by νῦν, 22.505-6)
2b)	common past of father and son: Hector's protection of Troy gives Astyanax his name (22.507)
3b)	present fate of the father's body (22.508-510)
5b)	future of father: recipient of offerings and κλέος (22.511-4)

The γόος draws an analogy between the interrelated separation of death and of orphanhood; the essential connection of the father's task with the son's identity is embodied in Andromache's account of Astyanax's name as stemming from the heroic activity of his father and implying its continuation in the son. Similar sequences appear in Andromache's second γόος, addressed to both Hector (*Il.* 24.725-731, 740ff.) and Astyanax (*Il.* 24.732-9), where the future fate of Astyanax is related to the activity of his father on the battlefield; the revenge of the Achaean warrior on Astyanax for his father or son lost to Hector serves as a foil for the common decline of Hector and his son:

> ...ἤ τις Ἀχαιῶν
> ῥίψει χειρὸς ἑλὼν ἀπὸ πύργου λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον
> χωόμενος, ᾧ δή που ἀδελφεὸν ἔκτανεν Ἕκτωρ

---

[99] e.g. Hector and Astyanax (*Il.* 22.477ff. and 24.725ff. [Andromache]) and Odysseus and Telemachus (*Od.* 4.721ff. [Penelope]). See Svenbro 76-90 on the naming of heroes' sons as signifying an extension of the activity, and therefore the κλέος, of their fathers, e.g. Telemachus and Odysseus (88); see also Steve Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1993): 197-8 on doublet type scenes in the Odyssey, e.g. the analogous hospitality scenes of Telemachus and Odysseus (*Od.* 4.113-6, 8.83-92) which reflect 'a sympathetic harmony between father and son.'

ἢ πατέρ' ἠὲ καὶ υἱόν, ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλοὶ 'Αχαιῶν
"Εκτορος ἐν παλάμῃσιν ὀδὰξ ἕλον ἄσπετον οὖδας.
οὐ γὰρ μείλιχος ἔσκε πατὴρ τεὸς ἐν δαῒ λυγρῇ (*Il.* 24.734-8).

Likewise, Penelope's γόος (*Od.* 4.722-741) focuses mainly on the departure of Telemachus and brings her son's absence into analogy with that of his father.

The lament begins with the departure of Odysseus as a past loss and as a foil for Penelope's present lament at Telemachus' departure (4.724-5); the γόος then turns to contrast Odysseus' κλέος εὐρύ (4.726) with the undistinguished departure of his son (ἀκλέα ἐκ μεγάρων, 728). Through the connections established between father and son, the future threat to Telemachus' life appears as a threat to the continuity of the family's male heroic lineage: οἳ μεμάασιν / ... 'Οδυσσῆος φθῖσαι γόνον ἀντιθέοιο (4.740-1). As the heroes' sons extend their fathers' activity, the infancy or absence of the hero's son prevents the transition past the liminal moment of the hero's death to the accession of his son; this doublet lament is typical of the γόος and its attempt to mediate the liminal moment by mastering both the chronological and the social shift from the presence to the absence of the hero.

The γόος is characterized by various conventional elements of content, structure, and performance; yet its position as a woman's genre of speech is practically unique in the Homeric poems *per se*, and its strategies of assigning meaning to the hero's death through the interrelationship of women's narratives of birth, marriage, and individual experience with the heroic narrative of war and death are also remarkable.[100] The woman's emphatic connection to the heroes as mother, wife, and mourner underlines her authority as a speaker or singer who mediates the final ritual passage of the dead hero into stable death and the critical transition of the household from the heroes to their sons. Yet, as the epic represents it, the γόος effects solely the social transition of the household between generations, while its own diachronic significance as an individual composition and as a performative genre are minimized. Since death marks the end of the hero's generation of κλέος and others' ongoing speech about him in the heroic or civic sphere[101], epic comes to characterize the γόος lament

---

[100] Note especially the frequent first person and the emphatic use of various forms of ἐγώ and ἐμός in the γόοι, e.g. ἐμῷ... θυμῷ (*Il.* 18.53 [Thetis]), ὤ μοι ἐγώ (18.54), ἐγὼ θρέψασα (18.57), μοι ζώει (18.61); ἐμῷ θυμῷ (24.748 [Hecabe]), μοι ζωός (24.749), παῖδας ἐμούς (24.751), μοι ἐρσήεις (24.757).

[101] e.g. ...ὅ μοι νύκτας τε καὶ ἦμαρ
εὐχωλὴ κατὰ ἄστυ πελέσκεο, πᾶσι τ' ὄνειαρ

for the dead hero as a negative genre that stands in opposition to its own project of perpetuating heroic memory.[102]

1.2.2 *The γόος in the Heroic Milieu*

As we have seen above, the emphasis of the γόος remains familial or individual; its attention centers on death as an immediate moment of transition, turning to action only when the hero is still alive. The Homeric poems therefore characterize γόος and lament in general as passive[103] and without πρῆξις (*Il.* 24.524). As seen above, both grief and verbalized lament appear in situations where they are interrupted in favor of action, as for example when the hero is endangered but still alive or in wartime, when revenge for a death can be exacted in combat. The predominantly female and domestic lament for the dead hero thus stands in contrast to these heroic modes of grief, which are viewed as an acceptable expression of male solidarity in battlefield contexts[104], where they are interrupted or

---

Τρωσί τε καὶ Τρῳῇσι κατὰ πτόλιν, οἵ σε θεὸν ὣς
δειδέχατ'. ἦ γὰρ καί σφι μάλα μέγα κῦδος ἔησθα
ζωὸς ἐών. νῦν αὖ θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κιχάνει. (*Il.* 22.432-6 [Hecabe])

[102]Arnould (148) argues that the γόος represents an active form of mourning, in that it possesses various identifiable stages: the signal given to start it (*Il.* 18.51 [Thetis], 22.430 [Hecabe], 23.17 [Achilles], 24.723 [Andromache], 747 [Hecabe], 761 [Helen]), raising the desire for γόος (γόου ἵμερον ὦρσε or the like, e.g. *Il.* 23.14 [Achilles]), enjoyment of the γόος (ὀλοῖο τεταρπώμεσθα γόοιο or the like, e.g. *Il.* 23.10 [Achilles]). As a ritually performed oral genre, the γόος naturally consists of a series of various verbal, physical, and psychological activities. Yet, as I argue here, epic values the hero's return to martial or other heroic activity in response to grief over engagement in the γόος, a female genre which marks the end of heroic activity and lacks the diachronic durability of the σῆμα as material monument or of the epic as an orally transmitted genre that perpetuates memory. The epic therefore portrays the lament as an active performance, but one without long-term effects.

[103] Especially noteworthy is the consistent association of γόος and other types of mourning in men with a passive posture of sitting:

ἀχεύειν / ἄχνυσθαι: *Od.* 4.100-4 (καθήμενος 101 [Menelaus]), 14.40-1 (ἧμαι 41 [Eumaeus]).

γόος : *Il.* 24.160-2 (καθήμενοι 161 [Priam's family]), *Od.* 4.100-4 (καθήμενος 101 [Menelaus]), 16.142-5 (ἧσται 145 [Laertes]), 19.118-120 (ἧσθαι 120 [Odysseus]).

κλαίειν: *Od.* 4.539 (καθήμενος [Menelaus]), 5.82 (καθήμενος [Odysseus on Kalypso's island]), 10.497 (καθήμενος [Odysseus at learning of his necessary trip to Hades]).

μύρεσθαι: *Od.* 19.118-120 (ἧσθαι 120 [Odysseus]).

ὀδύρεσθαι: *Od.* 4.100-4 (καθήμενος 101 [Menelaus]), 5.151-3 (καθήμενον 151); 9. 544-5 (ἧατ' 545),14.40-1 (ἧμαι 41), 16.142-5 (ἧσται 145).

στοναχή: *Od.* 16.142-5 (ἧσται 145).

Cf. Penelope at *Od.* 20.58 (καθεζομένη), 21.55-7 (ἑζομένη), and especially *Od.* 4.716-721 (ἐφέζεσθαι 717, ἷζε 718), where Penelope rejects the many chairs within her house in favor of sitting on the threshold (ἐπ' οὐδοῦ *Od.* 4.718) to mourn the absence of her husband and son.

[104] See Monsacré 141-2 on male weeping as acceptable within the framework of heroic solidarity on the battlefield.

overcome, and then translated into action of revenge or further fighting; otherwise, male heroes engage in prolonged mourning only with discretion in contexts outside of battle.[105] The Homeric poems thus imagine male mourning as a reinforcement of solidarity within the heroic group and as a channeling of the tensions at death toward the exterior through revenge on the enemy, the emphasis on ἑταῖροι, and the completion of ritual activity. By contrast, female lament represents an exceptional performance genre, in that it is the only formally performed female speech or song within the epic; while it allows female characters to comment on heroic action and events, it also occupies an ambiguous position as an antithesis to the larger heroic values of the epic and as a medium of social commentary within the immediate audience of kin. Lament not only mediates the immediate moment of transition, but also, with its domestic focus, tends to uncover potentially dangerous tensions or to assign blame within the social group rather than translating tensions to the exterior.[106] The γόοι reveal the dependence of the city on its hero, the negligence of maidservants, and the ambiguous treatment of the hero's orphan son or of a daughter-in-law[107] – all failures or weaknesses in the same social group that must be treated in the immediate aftermath of a lament. For this reason, the action of male grief directed toward the exterior remains preferential to the lament with its ambiguous yet necessary focus on the domestic crisis surrounding the immediate death.

Despite epic's representation of lament as generically ineffectual, female lament and funerary activity are inextricably connected with heroic boasting and flyting speeches on the battlefield.[108] The boasting or flyt-

---

[105] Arnould 51.

[106] See Holst-Warhaft 3 on the threatening nature of women's lament: 1) it stimulates potentially uncontrollable reciprocal violence within the social group; 2) its focus on immediate loss obstructs the community's or the state's attempt to appropriate the meaning of the death for its own ends; 3) it leaves women in control of two central life passages – birth and death. Cf. Alexiou's argument (21-2) that funeral legislation's later restriction of female mourning stems from the desire to suppress the power of female-influenced clans in favor of democracy with its collective institutions.

[107] dependence of the city on its hero: *Il.* 22.433-4 (Hecabe), 507, 24.728-30 (Andromache); negligence of maidservants: *Od.* 4.729-731 (Penelope); ambiguous treatment of the orphan (*Il.* 22.488-498 [Andromache]) or the daughter-in-law (*Il.* 24.767-775 [Helen]).

[108] On flyting, see Ward Parks, *Verbal dueling in heroic narrative: the Homeric and Old English traditions* (Princeton, 1990). As opposed to monologic boasting, flyting or the verbal duel is a dialogue between two essentially equal male speakers with eristic (competition for κλέος) and contractual (agreement on activities in which the opponents' cited prowess will be tested) content (35-7, 42-50); it occurs in battlefield contests between opponents, in guest-host bonding, and among members of the same social group (40-1). Although it is a specif-

ing speaker describes the lament over his victim or his loss of the proper funeral rites, in contrast to the assurance of funeral rites for the victor of the encounter[109]:

> ἆ δείλ', οὐ μέν σοί γε πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ
> ὄσσε καθαιρήσουσι θανόντι περ, ἀλλ' οἰωνοὶ
> ὠμησταὶ ἐρύουσι, περὶ πτερὰ πυκνὰ βαλόντες.
> αὐτὰρ ἔμ', εἴ κε θάνω, κτεριοῦσί γε δῖοι Ἀχαιοί (*Il.* 11.452-5)

> τῶ νῦν Τυδεΐδης, εἰ καὶ μάλα καρτερός ἐστι,
> φραζέσθω μή τίς οἱ ἀμείνων σεῖο μάχηται,
> μὴ δὴν Αἰγιάλεια, περίφρων Ἀδρηστίνη,
> ἐξ ὕπνου γοόωσα φίλους οἰκῆας ἐγείρῃ,
> κουρίδιον ποθέουσα πόσιν, τὸν ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν,
> ἰφθίμη ἄλοχος Διομήδεος ἱπποδάμοιο (*Il.* 5.410-5)

The threat of disfigurement of the corpse arises from the Greek heroic ideology of the 'beautiful death,' in which the interior worth of the hero is externalized in the moment of his death as a youthful fighter; the dead hero's youth is preserved in epic, thus insuring its persistence within the public realm. The threat to disfigure the corpse is tantamount to a threat to the opponent's lasting κλέος – the refusal of a physical and social site to the dead cuts off the connection between the heroic death in youth and the epic which commemorates the warrior beyond his lifetime.[110]

Why do the heroic boast or flyting exchange thematize women's lament, a genre which has no explicit connection with κλέος? The sole instance where a woman's lament mentions κλέος is Andromache's γόος,

---

ically male genre, women are nonetheless central in establishing the speakers' own sexual identity and status based on possession of women as sexual objects (11-3); as we shall see below, women are likewise central to this genre in that their mourning marks the defeat of the opponent and the success of the victor (e.g. *Il.* 18.121-5 [Achilles]).

[109] depriving opponent of burial rites and / or contrast with own burial: *Il.* 11.452-5 [Odysseus and Socus], 15.348-351 [Hector and cowardly Trojans], 16.836 [Hector to Patroclus], 22.335-6 [Achilles to Hector].

lament of women inspired by death of the opponent: *Il.* 5.412-6 [Diomedes' wife], 14.501-2 [parents of Ilioneus], 17.34-42 [Euphorbus' brother's widow], 18.121-4 [Achilles on Trojan women mourning at his return to war], 20.210-1 [Aeneas to Achilles].

Especially interesting are the parallel passages *Il.* 21.123-4 and 22.352-5, where Achilles threatens to deprive Priam's sons Lycaon and Hector of burial as well as of their mother's lament. See James Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad* (Chicago, 1975) 168 on the Homeric imagination of the funeral as the prerogative of the victor in war.

[110] Jean-Pierre Vernant, 'A "Beautiful Death" and the Disfigured Corpse in Homeric Epic,' in Jean-Pierre Vernant, *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays*, ed. Froma I. Zeitlin (Princeton, 1991): 50-74.

in which she promises an offering of women's weavings to be burned in Hector's honor:

> νῦν δὲ σὲ μὲν παρὰ νηυσὶ κορωνίσι, νόσφι τοκήων,
> αἰόλαι εὐλαὶ ἔδονται, ἐπεί κε κύνες κορέσωνται,
> γυμνόν. ἀτάρ τοι εἵματ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισι κέονται
> λεπτά τε καὶ χαρίεντα, τετυγμένα χερσὶ γυναικῶν.
> ἀλλ' ἤ τοι τάδε πάντα καταφλέξω πυρὶ κηλέῳ,
> οὐδέν σοί γ' ὄφελος, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐγκείσεαι αὐτοῖς,
> ἀλλὰ πρὸς Τρώων καὶ Τρωϊάδων κλέος εἶναι (*Il.* 22.508-514).

Andromache's mention of κλέος does not refer to her lament, but to the public and material gesture of offering textiles during Hector's funeral. This offering of women's woven work occurs because these weavings have no further use in the absence of the hero (οὐδέν σοί γ' ὄφελος, 513); rather than explicitly affirming women's expression through lament or through woven craft[111], the destruction of women's material work represents the last generation of κλέος at the conclusion of the hero's life. Even this κλέος through the offering of garments remains ambiguous, in that they emphasize the final state of the defeated hero as naked and vulnerable to preying animals. Thus, for the epic poems as we have them, the connection between lament and epic κλέος appears to lie in the position of the woman's lament as a kind of inverse epic. The heroic action of killing the opponent brings lasting κλέος for the hero – assuming he himself will receive proper burial – but the lament, focused as it is on the moment of passage from life to death, remains transitory and thus signifies the mortality of the warrior:

---

[111] P. E. Easterling's article on γόος ('Men's kleos and Women's goos: Female Voices in the Iliad,' *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 9 (1991): 145-151) argues that women's lament gives them a special position as potential commentators on the events and themes of the epic at large, a function which the author argues lies on a par with that of the Homeric bard through women's simultaneous association with weaving, which occasionally includes epic themes. Drawing on various passages, Easterling associates κλέος, weaving, and women's mourning through Andromache's lament and burning of clothing for Hector's κλέος at *Il.* 22.148-9; this is hardly an assertion of the interrelationship between women's artistic work and κλέος, as she destroys the textiles because they are no longer going to be used and, as precious items, their destruction within the context of funeral ritual will bring renown to Hector. While this passage acknowledges the material value of women's weaving, it does not recognize women's agency as artists of lament or of weaving, on a par with the bard. Instead, the material dedication of precious goods represents a source of κλέος for the dead in accordance with the general preference of material memorials such as the σῆμα to lament. In addition, Easterling disregards the association of women's mourning with the end of the hero's activity and generation of κλέος, as seen in the warrior's boast; as it signals the warrior's defeat, the lament is set in opposition to epic, which records the deeds of the living and both generates and preserves their κλέος.

...νῦν δὲ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀροίμην
καί τινα Τρωϊάδων καὶ Δαρδανίδων βαθυκόλπων
ἀμφοτέροισιν χερσὶ παρειάων ἁπαλάων
δάκρυ' ὀμορξαμένην ἀδινὸν στοναχῆσαι ἐφείην
γνοῖεν δ' ὡς δὴ δηρὸν ἐγὼ πολέμοιο πέπαυμαι. (*Il.* 18.121-5)

Here, heroic action wins κλέος and initiates lament among the female kin of Achilles' victims: the victims themselves are obscured by the narrative, leaving only a direct link between Achilles and the persistence of his memory through epic κλέος in the long term and through women's lament in the short term (γνοῖεν δ' ὡς... ἐγώ, 125).

The diction of the γόος itself reflects the opposition between heroic activity and lament. The remarkable concentration of kinship terminology in the γόοι (δαέρων, γαλόων, εἰνατήρ, ἑκυρός *Il.* 24.768-9) demonstrates their strong domestic coloring as much as their gender-conditioned speech. Yet the formulaic language of the γόοι consists of diction which is predominantly male; when the γόοι do use 'female' language, they almost exclusively draw their diction from other γόοι or speech of the same performer. When diction or structure is re-used in the γόοι, these features will often belong to the same speaker in other circumstances; this applies not only for formulaic language, but also for thematic complexes and structural features. For example, the laments for Hector in *Il.* 24 parallel the last meetings of each woman with Hector in *Il.* 6: Andromache recapitulates themes of the war, the fall of Troy and its consequences; Hecabe underlines the special relationship between Hector and the gods (*Il.* 6.258-260), and Helen draws attention to Hector's kindness and acceptance.[112] The transitional moment of burial leaves the epic language in the hands of the mourning women, but upon completion of the immediate transition through the crisis of the hero's death, this appropriation of male diction remains unique. The performers of the γόοι come to represent performers of a genre without continuity, except perhaps as an inverse version of the epic, signifying the end of the hero's quest for κλέος. As a women's account of the heroic narrative, lament is represented both as a derivative genre subordinated to the epic frame narrative and as a language that remains isolated to individual performers or to the single γόοι, without influence on the ongoing speech, action, and memory of the heroes.

[112] Monsacré 163-4.

One example of the formulaic isolation of the γόοι is the first γόος of Andromache at *Il.* 22.477-514[113]:

῞Εκτορ, ἐγὼ δύστηνος· ἰῇ ἄρα γιγνόμεθ' αἴσῃ
ἀμφότεροι, σὺ μὲν ἐν Τροίῃ Πριάμου *κατὰ δῶμα* *
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ **Θήβῃσιν *ὑπὸ Πλάκῳ ὑληέσσῃ***
ἐν δόμῳ Ηετίωνος[114], ὅ μ' ἔτρεφε *τυτθὸν ἐοῦσαν*
δύσμορος αἰνόμορον. ὡς μὴ φελλε τεκέσθαι.
νῦν δὲ ** *σὺ μὲν* 'Αΐδαο δόμους *ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης*
ἔρχεαι, αὐτεαρ ἐμὲ στυγερῷ ἐνὶ πένθεϊ λείπεις
χήρην[115] ***ἐν μεγάροισι*** **.[116] ***πάϊς ἔτι νήπιος αὔτως*** **[117],
ὃν τέκομεν σύ τ' ἐγώ τε δυσάμμοροι.[118] οὔτε σὺ τούτῳ
ἔσσεαι, ῞Εκτορ, ὄνειαρ, ἐπεὶ θάνες, οὔτε σοὶ οὗτος.
ἤν περ γὰρ * πόλεμόν γε φύγῃ *πολύδακρυν 'Αχαιῶν*
αἰεί τοι τούτῳ γε *πόνος καὶ κήδε' ὀπίσσω*
ἔσσοντ'. ἄλλοι γάρ οἱ ἀπουρίσσουσιν ἀρούρας.
ἦμαρ ὀρφανικὸν παναφήλικα παῖδα τίθησι
πάντα δ' ὑπεμνήμυκε, *δεδάκρυνται δὲ παρειαί,*
δευόμενος δέ τ' **ἄνεισι πάϊς**[119] ἐς πατρὸς ἑταίρους,
ἄλλον μὲν χλαίνης ἐρύων, ἄλλον *δὲ χιτῶνος.*
τῶν δ' ἐλεησάντων κοτύλην τις τυτθὸν ἐπέσχε,
χείλεα μέν τ' ἐδίην', ὑπερῴην δ' οὐκ ἐδίηνε.
τὸν δὲ καὶ ἀμφιθαλὴς ἐκ δαιτύος ἐστυφέλιξε,
χερσὶν πεπληγὼς καὶ ὀνειδείοισιν ἐνίσσων·
"ἔρρ' οὕτως· οὐ σός γε πατὴρ μεταδαίνυται ἡμῖν."
δακρυόεις δέ τ' **ἄνεισι πάϊς** ἐς μητέρα χήρην,
'Αστυάναξ, ὃς *πρὶν μὲν* ἑοῦ *ἐπὶ γούνασι* πατρὸς
μυελὸν οἶον ἔδεσκε καὶ οἰῶν *πίονα δημόν·*
αὐτὰρ ὅθ' ὕπνος ἕλοι παύσαιτό τε νηπιαχεύων,
εὕδεσκ' ἐν λέκτροισιν, *ἐν ἀγκαλίδεσσι* τιθήνης,
εὐνῇ ἔνι μαλακῇ, θαλέων ἐμπλησάμενος κῆρ.
νῦν δ' ** ἂν *πολλὰ πάθῃσι* *, φίλου ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἁμαρτών,
'Αστυάναξ, ὃν Τρῶες *ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν.*

---

[113] General formulae are marked by italics, formulae used by the same speaker in bold type, formula used primarily or solely by women marked with one asterisk, by women in γόοι with 2 asterisks.

[114] Only other usage is the preface to this γόος, *Il.* 22.472.

[115] See Richardson 159 on χήρη, a word used only by Andromache (*Il.* 6.408, 432, 22.499, 24.725).

[116] Approximates the only other similar usage at *Il.* 24. 725-6 [Andromache]: κὰδ δέ με χήρην / λείπεις ἐν μεγάροισι.

[117] cf. *Il.* 24.726 [Andromache] and others.

[118] cf. *Il.* 24.727 [Andromache].

[119] Only usage in the same γόος at *Il.* 22.499.

οἷος γάρ σφιν ἔρυσο *πύλας καὶ τείχεα μάκρα.*
*νῦν δὲ*** σὲ μὲν *παρὰ νηυσὶ κορωνίσι*, νόσφι τοκήων,
αἰόλαι εὐλαὶ ἔδονται, ἐπεί κε κύνες κορέσωνται,
γυμνόν. *ἀτάρ τοι* εἵματ' *ἐνὶ μεγάροισι*** κέονται
λεπτά τε καὶ χαρίεντα, τετυγμένα *χερσὶ γυναικρῶν.*
ἀλλ' ἤ τοι *τάδε πάντα*** καταφλέξω *πυρὶ κηλέῳ*,
οὐδέν σοί γ' ὄφελος, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐγκείσεαι αὐτοῖς,
ἀλλὰ *πρὸς Τρώων* καὶ Τρωϊάδων κλέος εἶναι.

The women's γόοι thus draw from the diction of the epic poem itself, yet in a singular context, as most of their formulae are never re-used by women; on the other hand, the γόοι make sparing usage of a common formulaic language and referentiality.[120]

Only a few features appear consistently in the shared formulaic language of the γόοι: 1) an exclamation ἐγὼ δύστηνος or the like, found predominantly in the introductions of γόοι; 2) a reference to the hero's abandonment of the mourner, using λείπειν in the second person, a feature unique to the γόοι; 3) reference to the interior of the home as the place of the widow or the abandoned goods of the hero; 4) a phrase including νῦν which connects the narratives of past and future by addressing the present liminal reality of the death – the state of the corpse, or, in the father-son doublet γόος, the helplessness of the son. As the epic represents it, the performance of the γόος thus resides with the individual female performer, who laments in predominantly male diction; on a limited scale, the mourner's language may re-use her own diction or the diction of other γόοι, but it represents no larger, collective referentiality such as that employed the bard of heroic poetry.

Nevertheless, general themes link the γόοι with other forms of verbalized lament marked with κλαίειν, ἄχνυσθαι, and ὀδύρεσθαι, or with speech accompanied by mourning, such as Achilles' laments for Patroclus (*Il.* 18.324-342, 19.315-337), Briseis' lament for Patroclus (*Il.* 19.287-300), and Priam's lament for Hector (*Il.* 22.416-428). Despite the strict formulaic isolation of the marked ritual lament in the formal context (γόοι), various common features of diction also appear in other unmarked laments, especially line-initial νῦν δέ or νῦν αὖ[121] and the superlative of φίλος with genitive.[122] Various recurring themes mark lament in general, thus providing a

[120] Formulaic analysis of all the marked female γόοι reveal similar patterns.
[121] *Il.* 18.333 (Achilles for Patroclus), 19.289 (Briseis for Patroclus), 319 (Achilles for Patroclus), cf. in the γόοι *Il.* 22.482, 505, 508 (Andromache), 24.757 (Hecabe).
[122] φίλταθ' ἑταῖρων *Il.* 19.315 (Achilles), cf. *Il.* 24.748 (Hecabe), 762 (Helen).

key to themes marked as lament within other genres of speech. These include the address of the dead by name[123] and by their relationship to the mourners[124], a strategy of memorialization that is similarly central for the written grave epigram. Both informal and ritual lament draw characteristic contrasts between life and death[125], between the present instance of death and other past experiences of death[126], and between wish and reality.[127] These themes of chronological and social rupture are underscored by reference to chronological cycles[128] and by the mourner's narration of other life passages such as birth and marriage[129]; the lament thus thematizes both the social relationship between the dead and the mourner[130] and the

---

[123] *Il.* 18.334 (Achilles), 19.287 (Briseis), cf. in the γόοι *Il.* 19.287 (Briseis), 315 (Achilles for Patroclus, with σύ), 22.431 (Hecabe), 477 (Andromache), 23.19 (Achilles), 24.725 (Andromache), 748 (Hecabe).

[124] In the γόοι, the kinship of the dead and the mourners is often established by the mention of the house: *Il.* 18.325, 331 (Achilles); cf. in the γόοι *Il.* 22.483, 510, 24.726 (Andromache), 757 (Hecabe), 768 (Helen), *Od.* 4.734 (Penelope). Thus, the γόοι often focus on the related theme of lost homecoming: *Il.* 18.330-2 (Achilles), cf. in the γόοι *Il.* 18.59-60 (Thetis), *Od.* 4.724-8 (Penelope). For his family, the hero's departure from the home spans the question of the warrior's possible homecoming in case of survival (ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γέροντες, / μνησάμενοι τὰ ἕκαστος *ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔλειπεν Il.* 19.338-9) and the availability of an avenger in case of death:

φράζεσθ' ὡς ὑμῖν Πρόμαχος δεδμημένος εὕδει
ἔγχει ἐμῷ, ἵνα μή τι κασιγνήτοιό γε ποινὴ
δηρὸν ἄτιτος ἔῃ. τῶ καί τις τ' εὔχεται ἀνὴρ
γνωτὸν *ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν* ἀρῆς ἀλκτῆρα *λιπέσθαι* (*Il.* 14.482-5)

[125] The laments contrast the past life and present death of the hero: *Il.* 19.288 (Briseis), cf. in the γόοι *Il.* 22.435-6 (Hecabe), 24.749-750 (Andromache). The contrast between the mourner ('I') and the dead ('you') emphasizes the misfortune of the speaker, usually with δυσάμμορος, δύστηνος or δειλός: *Il.* 19.287 (Briseis), 315 (Achilles), 22.428 (Priam), cf. in the γόοι *Il.* 18.54 (Thetis), 22.431 (Hecabe), 477, 481, 485, 24.727 (Andromache), 773 (Helen). See Alexiou 171 and Ferrari 263 on the contrast between the mourner and the deceased established at the beginning of the lament; Ferrari notes the frequently violent rupture in the initial apostrophe, which is often set apart from the rest of the lament by caesura.

[126] *Il.* 19.291-4 (Briseis), 321-327 (Achilles), 22.423-6 (Priam); cf. in the γόοι *Il.* 24.751-3 (Andromache).

[127] Usually a wish for different circumstances of birth or death for oneself or for the deceased: *Il.* 19.328-333 (Achilles), 22.426-8 (Priam), cf. in the γόοι *Il.* 22.481, 508-511 (Andromache), 24.764 (Helen), *Od.* 4.734 (Penelope).

[128] *Il.* 18.340 (Achilles), cf. in the γόοι *Il.* 22.432 (Hecabe), 24.745 (Andromache).

[129] birth and upbringing of children: *Il.* 22.421 (Priam), cf. in the γόοι *Il.* 18.55-7 (Thetis), 22.431 (Hecabe), 22.477-480, 484-5, 24.726-7 (Andromache), 748-753 (Hecabe), *Od.* 4.723 (Penelope); marriage: *Il.* 19.299 (Briseis), cf. in the γόοι *Il.* 24.763-6 (Helen), *Od.* 4.736 (Penelope).

[130] Lament occasionally emphasizes the kindness of the deceased; this theme appears only in the laments of Briseis and Helen and is thus seemingly connected with kinship through marriage (*Il.* 19.300, cf. in the γόοι *Il.* 24.771-5). The theme of kindness within the domestic setting contrasts strongly with the hero's aggression toward the exterior in Andromache's γόος: οὐ γὰρ μείλιχος ἔσκε πατὴρ τεὸς ἐν δαῒ λυγρῇ (*Il.* 24.739).

causes of their separation in death.[131] These themes common to the γόοι and other mourning speech further reveal the markedly female nature of lament; even outside marked mourning contexts, women's dialogue with or about their respective heroes often displays these thematic and structural strategies of lament, suggesting that the role of the heroes' wives and mothers is defined by their potentiality as mourners.[132]

During their encounter in Troy, Andromache's speech to Hector (*Il.* 6.407-439) displays formulaic, thematic and structural similarities with the speech of mourning. Her speech begins with an address to Hector (6.407), a prediction of his death and the consequences for herself and Astyanax (407-413), a central narrative section recounting the death of her family at the hands of Achilles (414-428), an illustration of Hector's relationship to Andromache within their kinship group (429-430), and a final interruption of the speech with ἀλλά and a suggested plan of action (431-9). This structure is analogous to that of the lament for the living hero, which is typically framed by an address of the hero, a central narrative section connected with the mourner's kinship group(s), and a final adhortation to action preceded by ἀλλά. Various themes from lament also reappear here: the misfortune of the speaker (ἔμ' ἄμμορον 408), the wish for her own death under other circumstances (410-1), the comparison of the anticipated death of Hector with the death of her family (414-

[131] The lament often imagines grief or the mourner's change in social role as imposed from the exterior: by the gods, by the enemy, or by the deceased himself, often with the verb τιθέναι in some form: *Il.* 22.422 (Priam), cf. in the γόοι *Il.* 22.490, 24.725-6, 741 (Andromache), *Od.* 4.722 (Penelope).

[132] In an unpublished paper, Richard Martin has argued that the Homeric Helen functions as 'a mythical paradigm of the expert performer of laments, an eternally keening woman.' Her speech in the *teichoskopia* (*Il.* 3.171ff.) encompasses complex terms of kinship (172), mention of the kindness of the addressee (172), wishes for her own death (173), and a mention of marriage (174-5); it also includes chronological shifts marked with the characteristic νῦν δέ (3.234) and νῦν αὖτε (242). Likewise, her appearances in *Il.* 6 and *Od.* 4 are marked by mournful speech. As I argue below, the speech of the other wives and mothers of heroes is likewise characterized by formulaic, thematic, and structural similarity to marked laments; these features point to the role of the hero's female relatives as adjunct to his action, lamenting in potential form until his actual demise. Helen's speech is differentiated from that of the others in that it consciously underlines her expertise as performer. Beyond the performances of other mourners within and without the formal performance context, her character reflects aspects of the Muses, sorceresses, and the bard himself, whom she echoes in her speech (*Od.* 4.261, cf. *Il.* 2.488). She is a skilled and paradigmatic performer who engages in mimesis of other wives of the heroes, implying both her poetic skill (cf. *H. Apollo* 160-4) and, significantly enough, her mimesis of the antiphonal and mournful speech of the absent heroes' wives: ἐκ δ' ὀνομακλήδην Δαναῶν ὀνόμαζες ἀρίστους, / πάντων 'Αργείων φωνὴν ἴσκουσ' ἀλόχοισιν (*Od.* 4.278-9). The intimate relationship between epic and lament is underscored by the frame of our *Iliad* itself, which begins with the invocation of the Muse and concludes with Helen's lament.

428), and Hector's activation of Andromache's and Astyanax's new social roles as widow and orphan (432). The speech likewise exhibits formulae from Andromache's later laments: ἐν(ὶ) μεγάροισι (421, 428, cf. 22.484, 510) and ὑπὸ Πλάκῳ ὑληέσσῃ (cf. 425, 22.479).

Similar formulaic, thematic, and structural features appear in Penelope's interchanges with Odysseus in his disguise as a beggar, as for example at *Od.* 19.124-163. The speech begins with the departure of Odysseus (124-8), leading to the present state of chaos in the household (prefaced by νῦν δέ 129-137), including an extended narration of her weaving Laertes' shroud in order to avoid marriage (138-156), which ends in the present pressure for her to remarry, prefaced by νῦν δέ (157-161). Again, as in Andromache's speech discussed above, and as in the γόοι for those expected dead, the mournful speech is broken off with ἀλλά and a suggestion for action (162-3). As above, Penelope's speech encompasses various themes from lament: the agency of the gods in her grief (124-5, 129), her preferred circumstances for Odysseus' death (127-8), mention of marriage and remarriage (137, 157-9), and cycles of day and night (149-150). This thematic resonance with lament is matched by formulaic resonances – νῦν δέ (129, 157) and ἐν μεγάροισι (139). The difference between Penelope and the other mourning wives and mothers lies in the fated return of her husband; Penelope's speech ceases with Odysseus' return to the home and the hero himself acknowledges the complementary roles of his own heroic action and her continued mourning: ὦ γύναι, ἤδη μὲν πολέων κεκορήμεθ' ἀέθλων / ἀμφοτέρω, σὺ μὲν ενθάδ' ἐμὸν πολυκηδέα νόστον / κλαίουσ'... (*Od.* 23.350-2). While the γόοι share few common formulae among themselves and with other forms of lament, the shared thematic basis of laments in general is broader; the predominance of mourning language in women's speech with or about their hero underlines their continued potentiality as mourners, a role that supplements heroic action while the hero is alive, but concludes with formal lament at the hero's death, marking the end of his quest for epic κλέος.

By contrast to the lament, the Homeric epic privileges its own narrative of heroic κλέος and the heroes' material memorials, such as the heaped-up mound of earth or other distinctive grave marker (τύμβος, σῆμα), which represent both the fulfillment of death ritual and a location which generates κλέος. Σῆμα and τύμβος designate the physical construction of the grave in Homer; both are used of the grave as a landmark[133], as a ritu-

[133] σῆμα: *Il.* 2.814 (grave of Myrine outside Troy), 11.166 (grave of Ilus, outside Troy), 371 (grave of Ilus with stele), 23.326-333 (sign / turning-post / grave at funeral games),

al or honorary gesture[134], and as a marker of the location of the dead.[135] Both σῆμα and τύμβος are the locus of heroic speech, from present consultation[136], to future remembrance of the dead (Elpenor *Od.* 11.74-6) or of those who conquer the dead (Hector, *Il.* 7.86-9). The hero's grave is also the forum for speech and action directed toward the dead – when Menelaus is wounded, Agamemnon imagines the Trojans leaping on Menelaus' τύμβος and mocking Agamenon's failure to bring his brother home from the war.[137] The τύμβος creates lasting κλέος for its recipient and his descendants into the distant future (τύμβο[ς]... τηλεφανής... τοῖς οἳ νῦν γεγάασι καὶ οἳ μετόπισθεν ἔσονται, *Od.* 24.80-4[138]) and encapsulates the name of the dead for long-term κλέος: ὡς σὺ μὲν οὐδὲ θανὼν ὄνομ' ὤλεσας, ἀλλά τοι αἰεὶ / πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους κλέος ἔσσεται ἐσθλὸν, Ἀχιλλεῦ (*Od.* 24.93-4). The dilemma of Telemachus in the absence of his father helps illustrate this connection between lament, the σῆμα, and κλέος. After his disappearance, the Achaeans have built no τύμβος for Odysseus which secures his reputation and creates κλέος for his son; the result is a crisis in the house, static and continued γόοι, and the diminished control of the family resources (*Od.* 1.239-248). By contrast to the physical construction and diachronic aspirations of the σῆμα or the τύμβος, there is no explicit aspiration to generate lasting κλέος for the deceased in the γόοι, except when Andromache promises an offering of textiles at Hector's tomb (*Il.* 22.510-4); only the physical remains of the ritual create lasting κλέος, while the performed lament manages solely the moment of transition between past, present, and future.

The difference between the σῆμα or τύμβος and the forms of women's

---

24.349 (grave of Ilus); τύμβος: *Il.* 2.604 (Arcadian grave of Aeputus), 793 (grave of Aesyetes near Troy).

134 σῆμα *Il.* 6.419 (Achilles buries Eetion), 23.45 (Achilles burying Patroclus), 24.799-801 (burial of Hector); *Od.* 1.291, 2.222 (Telemachus' σῆμα for Odysseus if dead); τύμβος *Il.* 21.323 (Scamander trying to kill Achilles and deprive him of burial in an earthen grave), 23.245 (Patroclus' grave), 24.667 (burial of Hector); *Od.* 1.239 (lack of grave for Odysseus), 4.582-6 (Menelaus for Agamemnon), 11.73, 77, 12.14-5 (Elpenor), 24.30-4 (Agamemnon's misfortune not to be buried in Troy), 80-4 (burials in Troy). The τύμβος derives its meaning from its production through ritual activity (*Il.* 23.255-7 [Patroclus' grave]) and serves as a sign of the ritual (e.g. Menelaus' hecatombs for Agamemnon, *Od.* 4.582-6) incorporated by the mound and the stele which may be affixed to it, which together form the γέρας θανόντων: *Il.* 16.457, 675 (Sarpedon's burial), cf. *Od.* 12.14-5 (Elpenor).

135 σῆμα: *Il.* 21.323 (Scamander on covering Achilles so as to deprive him of burial).

136 e.g. *Il.* 10.415 (Hector in counsel at grave of Ilus).

137 *Il.* 4.176-2, cf. Achilles driving the body of Hector around Patroclus' σῆμα *Il.* 24.16, 51, 416.

138 Cf. *Od.* 1.240 (Odysseus' grave), 4.584 (Menelaus for Agamemnon), 24.32-4 (Agamemnon's misfortune not to be buried in Troy).

lament lies in the difference between communicative and cultural memory[139]: the oral lament communicates solely among the generations present at the individual death ritual, while the σῆμα or τύμβος provides an enduring visual impression and a material site that generate continued speech and κλέος (τύμβο[ς]... τηλεφανής, *Od.* 24.83). Yet the problem of the grave marker is its polysemous nature; as Nagy has shown, the σῆμα which Nestor points out to Antilochus at *Il.* 23.326ff. is at once a sign, turning-post, and hero's grave, requiring the viewer to interpret it (νοεῖν)[140]; the σῆμα-as-grave can be read both as the sign of the location of the dead (e.g. Elpenor *Od.* 11.74-6) or of the victor over the dead (Hector *Il.* 7.86-9). The physical grave as landmark, sign, turning post and place of counsel allies itself not only with the activities of living men, but also with the constant signification of the hero's identity and the generation of κλέος-bearing interpretation; the function of the grave mound and the epic are similarly construed for continued interpretation and understanding in future generations (ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι, *Il.* 22.304-5, *Od.*11.74-76).[141]

The various media of mourning operate in a spectrum of personal and chronological functions: from ἄχος and other forms of mourning to the ritual lament, the uninscribed σῆμα or τύμβος, and epic κλέος. These various forms of verbal and material memorialization display different levels of negotiation between passive and active, female and male, and individual, familial, and collective expressions of grief. Of the different forms of mourning, ἄχος is most closely associated with an active response to grief, including speech to motivate or re-narrate action; the predominantly male heroic ἄχος is characterized by emphasis on collective male solidarity, even in the face of personal involvement with the deceased. By contrast, the female γόος performs the immediate familial mediation of death and embodies the role of the heroes' womenfolk as continual mourners in parallel with heroic male action; although lament represents a female

---

[139] Jan Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich, 1992): 50-5. Assmann differentiates communicative from cultural memory as follows – communicative memory is the transmission of information between generations which preserves the recent past up until a complete generational change has occurred and personally relevant memory is lost; by contrast, cultural memory preserves fixed events in the past with sacral or extraordinary meaning over a longer period of time. While communicative memory is universally accessible and informally transmitted, cultural memory is often the domain of specialists (e.g. bards).

[140] Gregory Nagy, 'Sema and Noesis: The Hero's Tomb and the 'Reading' of Symbols in Homer and Hesiod,' *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca, 1992): 202-222, cf. also Ecker 43 and Sourvinou-Inwood 134-6 on the usages of σῆμα.

[141] J. -P. Vernant, 'Panta Kala: From Homer to Simonides,' in Jean-Pierre Vernant, *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays*, ed. Froma I. Zeitlin (Princeton, 1991): 87.

commentary on heroic action and events, epic represents it as a linguistically and generically limited performance and as a genre that functions as an inverse of its own project of memory in that it marks the end of the hero's activity and of his quest for κλέος. The heroic warrior's σῆμα or τύμβος represents a diachronically durable memorial that bridges the gap between immediate death ritual and cultural memory as well as between individual and collective relevance; while it can continually generate κλέος, its accurate transmission of memory is limited by its polysemy, which allows varied interpretations regarding both its function and the deceased buried at the site. Within the Homeric poems, epic κλέος alone unites individual and collective significance in a form that is viewed as accurately preserving cultural memory of the individual deceased. This constellation of Homeric genres of memory influences the form and themes of the inscribed memorial – the varying negotiation between individual and collective relevance, the emphasis on an active response to grief, and the concern with accurate memory in κλέος.

1.3 *The Hero's Mourning: The Revenge for Patroclus and Odysseus'* νόστος

Many scholars have already pointed out the outstanding nature of Achilles' mourning for Patroclus: the same can be said of the lament for Odysseus in the *Odyssey*. As Nagy has shown, both Achilles and Odysseus are associated with mourning through their personal connection to the action of the epic narrative. Achilles' identity is connected with both ongoing personal ἄχος over the losses of Briseis and Patroclus and with collective ἄχος of his opponents' λαός when he engages in war and of his own λαός when he withdraws from war.[142] Achilles embodies the contrast between personally-motivated grief (ἄχος and πένθος) and the transmitted memory and entertainment of κλέος in the epic; individual involvement represents the fine distinction between πένθος ἄλαστον and κλέος ἄφθιτον, the genres of personal and cultural memory respectively.[143] Odysseus' lament at hearing Demodocus' song appears in a simile to a woman weeping over her dead husband, so that the hero's mourning approximates the weeping of his own victims in the war and so reveals his personal connection with the epic performed among the Phaeacians (*Od.* 8.521-541).[144]

---

[142] Nagy *Best of the Achaeans* 69-81.
[143] Nagy *Best of the Achaeans* 94-5, 113.
[144] Nagy *Best of the Achaeans* 98-101.

Yet, beyond the protagonist's personal involvement with the events of epic κλέος, each hero's struggle to attain heroic status and to prevail in his environment hinges upon a liminal period which involves mourning: Achilles conducts a prolonged and exceptional period of mourning for Patroclus, while Odysseus' protracted νόστος leaves his household in a static condition of mourning, with his wife between loyalty, widowhood, and remarriage, and his son between youth and manhood. The mourning of and for the epic protagonist both shapes and deviates from the general genres of mourning speech and behavior elaborated above; in my discussion below, I will explore the significance of mourning for the heroic society through closer readings of each hero's mourning and its reflection of and departure from the relative position of the mourning media throughout the rest of the epic narrative.

Much has been written about the outstanding mourning of Achilles for Patroclus in terms of ritual, but not in terms of lament. Achilles' position as a mourner is complex and extraordinary; his behavior inverts both ritual norms and referentially acceptable gestures of mourning and thus forms the central crisis in the last books of the *Iliad*. Following Reece's method for the characterization of type scenes[145], it is possible to isolate the elements of the mourning scene. The codes of action are different for men and women. Women's mourning scenes begin with disordering of the mourner's head by tearing hair or removing a veil; at the point of visual recognition of the deceased, there is an individual or collective cry, followed by the gathering of a group of women or men and women to mourn, at which time the mourners clasp the head of the deceased or beat their breasts and finally turn to a γόος or lament, followed by nonverbalized weeping.[146] The male mourning scenes consist of alternations between

---

[145] Reece 6-9.

[146] 1) tearing hair: *Il.* 22.405-6 (Hecabe for Hector), 24.710-1 (Andromache and Hecabe for Hector); removal of veil: *Il.* 22.406-7 (Hecabe for Hector), 468-472 (Andromache for Hector);

2) sight of the dead: *Il.* 19.283 (Briseis for Patroclus), 22.407 (Hecabe and Hector), 22.463-4 (Andromache and Hector), 24.702 (Cassandra and Hector), *Od.* 8.526 (wife and husband, simile for Odysseus' grief);

3) cry (κωκύειν, ἰάχειν): *Il.* 18.29 (women for Patroclus), 37 (Thetis for Achilles), 19.284 (Briseis for Patroclus), 22.407 (Hecabe for Hector), 24.702 (Cassandra for Hector), *Od.* 8.527 (wife for husband), 24.295 (Penelope for Odysseus);

4) gathering to mourn: *Il.* 18.30 (women for Patroclus), 37 (Nereids and Thetis); 22.473-4 (Andromache and Trojan women);

5) clasping the head or the body of the deceased: *Il.* 24.712 (Andromache and Hecabe), 724 (Andromache); *Od.* 8.523, 527 (wife and husband); beating or disfiguring of the mourner's chest or face: *Il.* 18.30-1 (women for Patroclus), 51 (Nereids); 19.284-5 (Briseis),

ritual action accompanied by weeping[147] and various mourning gestures[148], followed by the burning of the corpse, the gathering of the bones of the deceased, and the construction of a tomb.[149] By examining the traditional gestures in mourning scenes, we recognize the extraordinary aspect of Achilles' mourning. His ritual activities deviate from the typical funeral – the covering of Patroclus' body with hair cuttings (*Il.* 23.135ff.), the invocation of the dead in the context of a vow (23.19, 179), and the pouring of libations during cremation (*Il.* 23.196), not to mention the excessive length of Achilles' mourning and his odd choices of sacrificial victims (humans, dogs, horses) and liquids (the usually sacrificial honey and oil).[150] His unconventional movements include several that belong to the gestural code of female mourning: touching Patroclus' chest (*Il.* 23.18), performance of an abnormally threatening γόος (23.19-23), clasping Patroclus' head (23.136), and his explicit departure from the usual funeral procedure: ἔνθ' αὖτ' ἄλλ' ἐνόησε ποδάρκης δῖος 'Αχιλλεύς... (23.140).

Od. 8.530 (wife for husband); closing the corpse's eyes *Od.* 24.296 (Penelope for Odysseus); 6) γόος or other lament followed by weeping.

[147] cleansing, gathering, transportation, and covering of the corpse or movement around the corpse: *Il.* 7.332-3 (gathering and transportation of Achaean dead), 424-6 (cleansing and transportation of Trojan dead), 13.656-8 (transportation of Harpalion's body), 18.231-5, 343-355 (cleansing and prothesis of Patroclus); 23.13-4 (horseriding around Patroclus), 134-6 (transportation and covering Patroclus with offerings of hair), 24.696-7 (transport of Hector to Troy), *Od.* 12.9-10 (transportation of Elpenor), 24.417 (removal of dead suitors from Odysseus' house). For a more detailed treatment of ritual sequences in the funerals of Patroclus, Hector, and Achilles, see Robert Garland, 'Geras thanonton: An Investigation into the Claims of the Homeric Dead,' *BICS* 29 (1982): 69-80, esp. 72.

[148] nonverbalized groaning or lament: *Il.* 18.32-5 (Achilles and Antilochos for Patroclus), 22.408 (Priam for Hector), 24.160 (Priam's family); dirtying or wetting of head and clothing: *Il.* 18.23-5 (Achilles for Patroclus), 22.414 (Priam for Hector), 23.15-6 (warriors for Patroclus), 24.162-5 (Priam's family); rolling or lying on ground: *Il.* 18.26-7 (Achilles for Patroclus), 24.165 (Priam), *Od.* 4.541 (Menelaus for Agamemnon); tearing and dirtying of hair: *Il.* 18.27 (Achilles for Patroclus); sitting: *Il.* 24.161 (Priam's family), *Od.* 4.539 (Menelaus for Agamemnon).

[149] burning of corpses: *Il.* 7.333-4 (Achaean dead), 428-9 (Trojan dead) 431-2 (Achaean dead), 23.138-9, 163-228 (cremation of Patroclus), 24.778-792 (cremation of Hector), *Od.* 11.74, 12.11-13 (Elpenor); gathering of bones: *Il.* 7.334-5 (Achaean dead), 23.238-244, 252-254 (Patroclus), 24.792-6 (Hector); pouring of tomb onto pyre site: *Il.* 7.336-7, 434-6 (Achaean dead), 23.245-8, 255-7 (Patroclus), 24.797-801 (Hector), *Od.* 4.584 (Agamemnon), 11.75-6, 12.14-5 (Elpenor). For a detailed analysis of the three more extensive Homeric funerals (Patroclus, Hector, and Achilles) and their variations, see M. W. Edwards, 'The Conventions of a Homeric Funeral,' *Studies in Honour of T. B Webster* (Bristol, 1987): 84-92.

[150] Garland 'Geras thanonton' 72. Patroclus' martial excesses and Achilles' anomalous funeral for Patroclus parallel Achilles' martial excesses and his own anticipated death. There is a similar parallelism between Achilles' excessive honor to Patroclus and his excessive dishonor of Hector; see Annie Schnapp-Gourbeillon, 'Les funérailles de Patrocle,' *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, ed. G. Gnoli and J.-P. Vernant (London, 1982): 77-88.

Monsacré (183-4) has argued that male mourning is violent and immediate like heroic action, while women have a relatively limited range of expression confined by ritual guidelines; in actuality, both male and female mourning include violent gestures (e.g. tearing of the hair) and reveal relative flexibility in performance order, but differ mainly in their effect. While female mourning focuses on momentary verbal and ritual commemoration of the dead that leaves no visible monument, male mourning secures the mortal remains and creates a lasting monument for the dead, which is the prerequisite for the persistence of κλέος. Yet Achilles' individual activity is aimed less at generating or preserving Patroclus' memory than at taking revenge on Hector. Achilles' abuse of Hector is to be read as an inverse of his ritual glorification of Patroclus; it is a behavior which diminishes the future κλέος of his opponent and bypasses the form of the σῆμα by suspending funeral ritual and anticipating the epic κλέος of his friend through his own martial activity rather than through the usual ritual closure. Achilles' return to battle generates κλέος (*Il.* 18.121-5) for himself and the warrior whom he avenges, while setting off the lament of the Trojan women that serves as a foil for his martial success; this symbiotic relationship between the hero's martial activity and his opponents' and his own mourning illustrates the crucial role of lament for Achilles as epic protagonist.

Achilles is outstanding in his connection with women's lament, both as a mourner himself and as the hero who initiates lament over his opponents. By disfiguring the corpse of Hector, Achilles creates a rupture in the Trojan women's mourning: Hecabe and Andromache perform two sets of laments, with and without the presence of Hector. These two sets of γόοι enclose Achilles' funeral rites for Patroclus and the divine and human petitions for the return of Hector's corpse; this is a liminal period both because of the ongoing funeral rites which negotiate between Patroclus' living and dead states, and because of the gradual transition away from Achilles' excessive mourning for Patroclus to moderation and the final burial of Hector. In this liminal period, Achilles forces the Trojan women to mourn for Patroclus, a non-kin enemy (*Il.* 18.336-342). His disfigurement of the corpse, human sacrifice, and his placement of Hector head down in the dust (i.e. an inversion of the usual ritual handling of the upper body) also represent ruptures in the form of death ritual that signal the excessive nature of Achilles' grief.[151]

---

151 Monsacré 193 aptly notes that the mourning of Achilles concludes with his resumption of normalized activity – eating, sleeping (in the company of Briseis) and purifying himself.

Further, Achilles is the only Homeric male to perform a γόος – a performance which is first and foremost a departure from the general opposition between male grief and female lament, which otherwise limits the male γόος to informal and uncited contexts. Achilles' γόος also departs from the conventions of the genre by including themes more appropriate to a battlefield boast or threat.[152] Yet the exceptional lament of Achilles over Patroclus at *Il.* 23.19-23 also echoes the formulaic isolation of the other γόοι, with Achilles' multiple self citations, which perhaps reflect the nature of his lament as the fulfillment of a prior promise:

> ***χαῖρέ μοι, ὦ Πάτροκλε, καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισι.***
> ***πάντα γὰρ ἤδη τοι τελέω τὰ πάροιθεν ὑπέστην***[153]
> Ἕκτορα δεῦρ' ἐρύσας δώσειν κυσὶν *ὠμὰ δάσασθαι,*
> **δώδεκα δὲ προπάροιθε πυρῆς ἀποδειροτομήσειν**[154]
> **Τρώων ἀγλαὰ τέκνα, σέθεν κταμένοιο χολωθείς.**[155]

Achilles' lament bypasses the chronological mediation of the moment of death; its orientation toward the past and the future contrasts with the usual past-present-future format of the other γόοι (τελέω...πάροιθεν... χολωθείς, *Il.* 23.19-23); it leaves Patroclus' past, present, and future positions unelaborated, while Achilles' ritual and martial activity provide the chronological movement of the lament and transform the characteristically passive γόος into a performance spanning grief and the celebration of Achilles' own heroic action.

Following the death of Patroclus, this chronological rupture is also matched by Achilles' frequent use of νῦν δέ, the temporal marker of the transition between past life and present death in the γόοι.[156] This repeated

---

[152] On the characteristic speech of Achilles, see J. Griffin, 'Words and Speakers in Homer,' *JHS* 106 (1986): 36-57; Adam Parry, 'The language of Achilles,' *TAPA* 84 (1956): 124-134; Paul Friedrich and James Redfield, 'Speech as a Personality Symbol: The Case of Achilles,' *Language* 54 (1978): 263-288; and Martin passim on the characteristic speech of Achilles. Friedrich and Redfield note the formal effectiveness of Achilles' speech, but the lack of effectiveness of his speech within his social group (271). While Achilles' γόος does not function generically as such, the frequent appearance of νῦν δέ in Achilles' speech marks not only his contrasting hypothetical and real situations (Friedrich and Redfield 283), but also signifies and anticipates his activity as mourning protagonist.

[153] Cf. for example *Il.* 23.179-180, which is marked as a threat (ἀπειλήσας, 23.184).

[154] ἀποδειροτομέειν is among a wide range of vocabulary used solely by or about Achilles. As Griffin has noted (52-7), Achilles' unique vocabulary and epithets are excessively violent, while emphasizing the outstanding nature of his suffering (e.g. Achilles' hapax adjective θυμαλγής / θυμαρής passim and Thetis' hapax self-characterization as δυσαριστοτόκεια *Il.* 18.54)

[155] *Il.* 18.336-7.

[156] See Nagy *Best of the Achaeans* 102.

νῦν δέ initially marks Achilles' actions in returning to war and thus indicates the hero's attempt to mediate the present moment of death with a resumed quest for κλέος rather than conventional mourning[157]; yet once he defeats Hector and returns to bury Patroclus, νῦν δέ signals Achilles' participation in death ritual and reintegration into the other activities of the living.[158] Another outstanding feature of Achilles' γόος is its reproduction elsewhere, a feature used only in the γόοι for living heroes – a feature that suggests the ongoing liminality of Achilles' and Patroclus' position as mourner and mourned, as well as the interdependence of Patroclus' memory with Achilles' resumption of martial activity.

Achilles' violent transformation of lament and his fusion of lament and death ritual with his own heroic activity is central to his position as the epic protagonist. Achilles' choice of a martial death and κλέος over obscurity is exceptional in itself and implies the additional choice of the dead hero's κλέος, albeit at the cost of γόος, over an obscure death (*Il.* 9.412-6). His prolonged mourning and vengeance for Patroclus unites lament with the warrior's threat in his unusual γόος and parallels extreme honor in death ritual for Patroclus with extreme dishonor in revenge on the dead Hector. Achilles does violence to the conventions of lament by assimilating it to the heroic threat; yet he reveals ultimately also the close interdependence of κλέος and γόος in his threatening lament and in his own decision to resume martial activity to avenge Patroclus. The concluding liminality of the *Iliad* lies in this outstanding fusion of lament and heroic action in the character of Achilles, which is resolved only through the intervention of the gods for the return of Hector's corpse and the reestablishment of mourning convention in Achilles' mourning with Priam, both of which enable the long-suspended Trojan funeral for Hector to take place.

Similarly, the *Odyssey* displays the central position of the protagonist's

---

[157] *Il.* 18.121 (Achilles will earn κλέος through return to war), 333 (Achilles won't bury Patroclus until Hector is conquered); 19.23 (Achilles arming himself in fear of Patroclus' body decomposing), 67 (Achilles' cessation of his former anger so as to return to war), 148 (Achilles' postponement of receiving Agamemnon's gifts until after his engagement in war), 203 (why eat when those killed by Hector lie dead?), 275 (let Achaeans eat to allow return to war), 319 (former life and present death of Patroclus contrasted in κλαυθμός); 21.103 (Achilles will kill all Trojans encountered), 281 (Achilles' fear of death in river); 22.18 (Apollo robs Achilles of κῦδος), 268 (Hector must not supplicate Achilles, but fight like a warrior), 271 (Hector's death will pay back for Achaean deaths).

[158] *Il.* 22.391 (let Achaeans sing a paean after the death of Hector), 23.150 (dedication of a lock of hair to Patroclus), 158 (let the people disperse for closer mourners to perform death ritual for Patroclus); 24.601 (reminder to eat directed at Priam), 614 (Niobe as a weeping stone).

mourning in epic; here, the prolonged νόστος of Odysseus embodies the liminality of ongoing mourning and the impossibility of social resolution caused by the absence of the deceased. Odysseus' long νόστος circumscribes the parallel mourning of the hero's crew and his household, both of whom mourn for the completion of his homecoming. The crew is described as mourning both their remembered losses in the past[159] and the present and future dangers[160] facing them on their journey. Odysseus' crew mourns in a wide range of registers[161], which mark moments of liminality and indecision that must be interrupted or overcome for the continuation of their journey:

> ὠς ἐφάμην. τοῖσιν δὲ *κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ*
> *μνησαμένοις* ἔργων Λαιστρυγόνος Ἀντιφάταο
> Κύκλοπός τε βίης μεγαλήτορος, ἀνδροφάγοιο.
> *κλαῖον* δὲ λιγέως, θαλερὸν κατὰ *δάκρυ χέοντες*.
> ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ τις πρῆξις ἐγίγνετο *μυρομένοισιν*.
> αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ δίχα πάντας ἐϋκνήμιδας ἑταίρους
> ἠριθμέον, ἀρχὸν δὲ μετ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ὄπασσα... (*Od.* 10.198-204)[162]

Here, the immediate grief of Odysseus' crew (κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ, 198) stems from the memory of the past (μνησαμένοις, 199) leading to informal mourning accompanied by tears (κλαῖον... δάκρυ χέοντες 201) in a typical sequence of continued mourning interchange among the group (μυρομένοισιν, 202). The inactivity of the crew's mourning is interrupted only by Odysseus' authoritative commands to return to action. The continued mourning of the crew throughout the *Odyssey* underscores not only the ongoing liminality of their situation, but also the particular agency of the protagonist Odysseus as the authority over their mourning, their

---

[159] *Od.* 10.198-202 (crew remembering [μνησαμένοις 199] the Laistrygonians and the Cyclops), 12.309-311 (crew remembering [μνησάμενοι 309] the crew members eaten by Scylla).

[160] *Od.* 9.467-9 (crew mourns those killed by the Cyclops), 10.209 (departure of some of crew from the ship to Circe's island), 244-8 (Eurylochus narrates the fate of his companions on Circe's island), 453-47 (reunion of the crew on Circe's island), 566-9 (crew mourns at the prospect of travel to Hades), 11.5 (crew traveling to Hades), 12.12 (Odysseus' crew buries Elpenor), 234 (Odysseus and his crew at Scylla and Charybdis).

[161] ἄχος: *Od.* 10.247, 11.5, 12.12; γοᾶν 9.467, 10.209, 248, 457, 567, 12.234; κλαίειν: 9.469, 10.200, 10.209, 454, 12.309, 311; μύρεσθαι: 10.201, 568; ὀδύρεσθαι: 10.454; στενάχειν and related forms: 9.467, 10.454.

[162] Cf. especially *Od.* 9.467-9 (Odysseus interrupts his crew's mourning for the dead at the Cyclops' island to sail away), 10.244-250 (Eurylochus overcomes his grief to tell Odysseus about other crew members in danger on Circe's island), 453-7 (Circe tells Odysseus to restrain the mourning of his crew and to feast instead).

memory of loss and νόστος[163], and the resolution of the crisis through νόστος.

The absence of the hero also causes uncertainty for Odysseus' survivors in his family and in his social group: it endangers the remarriage of the hero's wife, the maturation and accession of his son to manhood, and the resulting transition of the household from the hero to his son. Odysseus' absence causes the continual mourning of his wife and the members of his household and their continued state of liminality which is seen as analogous to Odysseus' own quest for homecoming:

> ὦ γύναι, ἤδη μὲν πολέων κεκορήμεθ' ἀέθλων
> ἀμφοτέρω, σὺ μὲν ενθάδ' ἐμὸν πολυκηδέα νόστον
> κλαίουσ'· αὐτὰρ ἐμε Ζεὺς ἄλγεσι καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι
> ἱέμενον πεδάασκον ἐμῆς ἀπὸ πατρίδος αἴης. (*Od.* 23.350-3).

For Telemachus, the lack of oral or visual evidence of his father's life or death intensifies his grief:

> νῦν δ' ἑτέρως ἐβόλοντο θεοὶ κακὰ μητιόωντες,
> οἳ κεῖνον μὲν ἄϊστον ἐποίησαν περὶ πάντων
> ἀνθρώπων -- ἐπεὶ οὔ κε θανόντι περ ὧδ' ἀκαχοίμην,
> εἰ μετὰ οἷς ἑτάροισι δάμη Τρώων ἐνὶ δήμῳ
> ἠὲ φίλων ἐν χερσὶν, ἐπεὶ πόλεμον τολύπευσε. (*Od.* 1.234-8).

The disappearance of Odysseus without a tomb prevents Telemachus from accession to his father's heroic status (1.239-241), and the resulting lack of κλέος or any other evidence for Odysseus (ἀκλειῶς... ἄϊστος, ἄπυστος, 1.241-2) obstructs any attempt to address the situation. The grieving Telemachus is left in a passive state of expressing his ἄχος through mourning: ἐμοὶ δ' ὀδύνας τε γόους τε / κάλλιπεν (1.242-3). Telemachus' diction here displays various features of lament: repeated νῦν δέ (1.234, 241), the theme of being left behind by the departing hero (κάλλιπεν 1.243), and chronological shifts between past (232-3), present (1.234ff.), and future (1.250-1) of the Ithacan household – echoing the themes of the γόοι.

A similarly passive state of lament characterizes the fellow heroes of Odysseus whom Telemachus encounters in his journey to recover his father. For Odysseus' comrades, his absence precludes definitive heroic action, leaving them in continued passivity and lament:

---

163 For Odysseus as an authority over the crew's mourning, see *Od.* 9.468-9 (ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐκ εἴων... κλαίειν) and 10.456-7 ('Οδυσσεῦ, / μηκέτι νῦν θαλερὸν γόον ὄρνυτε...).

ἀλλ' ἔμπης πάντας μὲν ὀδυρομενος καὶ ἀχεύων
πολλάκις ἐν μεγάροισι καθήμενος ἡμετέροισιν
ἄλλοτε μέν τε γόῳ φρένα τέρπομαι, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
παύομαι...
...ἐμοὶ δ' ἄχος αἰὲν ἄλαστον
κείνου ὅπως δὴ δηρὸν ἀποίχεται, οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν,
ζώει ὅ γ' ἦ τέθνηκεν. (*Od.* 4.100-110, cf. 169-198)

Again, the long-term lack of information regarding Odysseus is an ἄχος that inspires lament but does not allow for heroic action in response; Menelaus' speech and behavior display features of lament similar to those of Telemachus: the reference to the interior of the home (ἐν μεγάροισι, 4.101), a seated posture of mourning, and a reference to the departure of Odysseus: Τηλέμαχός, ὃν λεῖπε νέον γεγαῶτ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ (4.112). The depictions of Laertes in a continual state of mourning, including fasting and a seated posture (16.142-5), parallel those of Telemachus and Odysseus' peers. It is tempting to see an intergenerational identification between the mourning and death-like states of Laertes, Odysseus and Telemachus; each man's mourning is resolved by the reappearance of the hero on Ithaca: Laertes' mournful old age and decline, itself connected with Penelope's weaving of the shroud; Odysseus' deathlike disappearance, in particular his laments on Calypso's island (5.81-4, 156-8) and on his journey to Hades; and the threatened position of Telemachus in perpetual mourning and liminality. The final autonomy of the hero's son is established by the double νόστος of father and son – Telemachus' mourning for Odysseus changes form upon his return from his journey to Pylos and Sparta: his family's ongoing ἄχος is interrupted for action leading to his father's νόστος: 'ἄλγιον, ἀλλ' ἔμπης μιν [the mourning Penelope] ἐάσομεν, ἀχνύμενοί περ... πρῶτόν κεν τοῦ πατρὸς ἑλοίμεθα νόστιμον ἦμαρ' (16.147-9); his journey into the realm of his father's invisibility (ἀκλέα ἐκ μεγάρων, 4.728), his parallel homecoming with Odysseus, and his near-success in the bow contest (21.128-9) allow him to claim his manhood.

The mourning of Achilles and Odysseus reveals the central place of grief and mourning for the Homeric protagonist: while the epic tradition views the lament and epic κλέος as opposite forms of commemoration, the hero adopts the stance of a mourner only to revert to action as a solution to his crisis, an action that is the marker of living hero in his continued quest for κλέος. Contrary to Monsacré's view, the hero does not overcome 'female' lament in order to reinforce his masculinity, but revises it. Achilles incorporates a singular assertion of male activity into the female genre by performing a lament that functions as a threat and thus forms a

bridge between the end of Patroclus' action and Achilles' own attainment of κλέος in returning to battle to avenge him. The *Odyssey* portrays the analogous activity of Odysseus as hero and Penelope as mourning wife, paralleled by intergenerational mourning that reveals the sympathetic actions of the three male generations of the Ithacan household; the parallel νόστοι of the hero and his son mark a double transition from mourning to heroic action[164], both of which activities are characterized by intergenerational solidarity. As seen above, mourning and lament for the dead hero represents the end of the hero's activity and the victory of his opponents; yet, rather than being rejected and overcome by the hero, the mourning of the living warrior represents an accepted facet of human behavior. Lament serves as a foil for heroic action and supplements its success by demonstrating the agency of the male hero and the solidarity between the mourner and the deceased, the hero and his wife, and the generations of the household.

Viewed through the lens of referentiality of formulae and type scenes, as well as through the definitive mourning of and for the protagonists, Homeric mourning provides the basis for investigating the effects of the introduction of writing on the memorialization of the dead. In the Homeric tradition, tensions between activity and passivity, between individual and collective memorialization, and between oral and material memorials are present. While the verbal genres of mourning and lament remain thematically removed from motifs of martial action and behavioral paradigm as well as generically removed from long-term transmission, epic combines the vital preservation of individual identity lacking in the lament and the polysemous σῆμα with a combination of speech and action in verbal form recording heroic action for memory and imitation.[165] The epic's and its heroes' active response to grief is privileged, and the poetry of memory diminishes the female lament and its explicit engagement with the transitional moment of death.

The essential points of ambiguity in the Homeric poems are the interdependence between the hero's burial and his memory and the uncertainty of the hero's passage from communicative to cultural memory. This

[164] Cf. the father-son doublet γόοι for Hector and Astyanax (*Il.* 22.477ff.) and Odysseus and Telemachus (*Od.* 4.722ff.).

[165] The epic representation of lament as generically and functionally limited could well indicate some historical agon between epic and lament as contemporary genres of memory; in the unfortunate absence of primary sources for the oral lament, this offers one possibility, if a fully speculative one, for explaining the epic representation of lament's subordinate position.

ambiguity is resolved by the merging of verbal and material memorial in the inscribed grave marker, which serves as the artifact of death ritual and as an increasingly historical record of the dead. The themes traditional in informal and ritual lament will re-emerge and be transformed in the new context of the written epigram: the address of the dead by name, now the central aspect of the inscribed memorial; juxtapositions of opposites, including the contrast between the mourner and the dead; and the emphasis on various life passages such as birth and marriage, especially apparent in the preferential use of writing to mark the extraordinary deaths of the young and unmarried. After the advent of script, the archaic epigram applies the newly available technology of writing to the gravesite with a strong awareness of the persistent motifs and ambiguities of the Homeric tradition; it consciously obscures the liminal moment of ritual passage, refashioning the grave epigram as an active civic male act in response to grief in an environment which increasingly marginalizes the female lament.

CHAPTER TWO

THE ARCHAIC EPIGRAM AND THE ADVENT OF WRITING

Above, I have examined the Homeric evidence for the early Greek oral-traditional perspective on lament as a genre. A wide spectrum of verbalized and nonverbalized lament exists, ranging from paralinguistic mourning and informal lament to the γόος, the cited formal lament within a ritual context. In general, the Homeric poems represent lament as problematic in that it represents a passive mode of self-expression that focuses on the immediate crisis of the hero's death and thus stands in opposition to the epic's depiction of living heroes. While both informal and ritual lament represent one of the sole contexts for women's commentary on heroic action, epic portrays it as a speech genre with ambiguous or even subversive content that is limited to single performers and performances. In marking the ritual passage of the hero to his death and the end of his activity, the lament can not record the accomplishments of the living and is therefore confined to a subordinate role as the foil to the activity of the living hero and as a singular and purely occasional genre that remains separate from the epic's traditional diction and paradigmatic function. Thus, the oral-traditional epic, the erection of a σῆμα, and active modes of mourning that inspire revenge or ritual action (e.a. ἄχνυσθαι) are privileged over the passive, reactive, and ephemeral female lament. In its singly relevant ritual context marking the end of the heroic life, the γόος contrasts not only with the permanence of the uninscribed and therefore potentially ambiguous σῆμα, but most of all with the epic, which preserves the memory of heroic activity within an ongoing poetic tradition.

As I will argue below, the advent of writing and written memorialization necessitates no replacement of lament with the written text nor any change in lament per se; rather, writing at the gravesite functions as a supplement to lament, extending the communicative possibilities of the mourners, but also introducing new advantages and problems because of the public and permanent nature of the gravesite. I will begin by examining how the inscribed grave marker is thematized by the epigram itself, and the different formats in which these functions are realized; I will investigate also how the epigram relates to other oral genres of lament

and poetry and how the presence of script transforms the characterization of the deceased and of mourners' activity.

As I will demonstrate below, the archaic epigrams display both continuities with oral tradition, such as oral rhetoric, formulaic diction, and various continuities of theme, as well as the new communicative possibilities offered by writing: a close association between visual and verbal messages, the preservation of the end product of death ritual, and the evolution of the inscribed gravestone into a historical document of the social and political relationships between mourners and the dead. In conclusion, I will survey the long-term developments from the Homeric constellation lament-σῆμα-κλέος via the archaic epigram to the classical period, focusing on the Persian War epigrams as a bridge between the individual warriors' epigrams of the archaic period and the advance of the civic burial site in the early fifth century.

With the onset of the archaic period, our written and iconographic sources for the historical performance of funeral ritual increase; this allows us to situate the grave epigram within the larger context of funerary ritual and thus to explore the additional possibilities of expression that it offers. The nature of the epigram as a written artifact and the presence of written sources for historical death ritual involve a shift in my discussion from the Homeric representation of mourning to a treatment of historical mourning and death ritual. This shift implies no direct historical development from Homeric to archaic mourning, as the Homeric representation of mourning addresses less a historically reconstructable performance than a depiction of death ritual acceptable to an epic audience. As a self-consciously public artifact of death ritual, the inscribed grave monument also functions as a representation of the dead and perpetuates various fictions about death, the dead, and mourning; while the epigram occupies a place within historical death ritual, it likewise draws thematically and formally on the traditional referential perspectives on lament persisting within archaic culture.

The archaic funerary ritual was tripartite and consisted of laying out and mourning for the dead (prothesis), the transportation of the corpse from the home to the gravesite (ekphora), and the deposition of remains at the gravesite. Classical sources indicate that the dying individual may have undergone various ritual preparations for death, including farewells, prayer, a ritual bath, and the settlement of personal affairs.[1] After death,

[1] Garland 16.

the deceased's body would be processed and arranged through various procedures, including closing the eyes, closing and binding the mouth, washing, anointing, clothing, and crowning the body, after which it probably would be placed probably indoors on a bier with feet facing the door[2]; various purificatory measures would be taken during this period both to mark the occurrence of death and to prevent pollution of mourners and their environment, such as the presence of water and the hanging of branches or hair at the doors to the house.[3] Iconographic representations of prothesis from the eighth century to ca. 400 BCE suggest that the prothesis served as the moment for performance of lament. On geometric amphorae, mourners stand, sit, and kneel around the bier. Female mourners occupy the central position at the head of the bier, sometimes holding the pillow, head, or upper body of the deceased, and raise both hands to their heads to beat their heads or to tear their hair; male mourners extend or raise a single hand to their head.[4] While later representations of the prothesis remain similar, they display a greater variety of gesture, are fewer in number and show reduced numbers of participants; perhaps this indicates a decreased interest in the theme or an increased control of expression through funerary legislation.[5] The evidence for the ekphora comes mainly from geometric depictions and funerary legislation; early in the day, the dead would be transported by a horse-drawn carriage to the gravesite, accompanied by a procession in which male mourners led and female mourners followed behind them.[6] The deposition of the body involves cremation and / or inhumation at different periods; after deposition of the body, the gravesite becomes the location of various ritual activities, such as mourning, decoration of the grave stele with ribbons, libations and offerings of food, locks of hair, and grave goods, as well as commemorative visits to the site at designated times following the death.[7]

As in the Homeric representations of mourning, the archaic and classical evidence for the performance of death ritual displays both active ritual surrounding the processing of the body and the establishment of the gravesite as well as reactive gesture and lament, which leave no artifact; at different stages, death ritual focuses on concrete treatment of the

---

[2] Alexiou 5-6, Garland 23-8, Siurla-Theodoridou 19-20, 61-3, 74-86.
[3] Garland 43-4, Vermeule 12-15.
[4] Alexiou 6, Garland 28-9, Siurla-Theodoridou 24-39.
[5] Garland 28-9, Siurla-Theodoridou 197-8, 207-223, 338.
[6] Garland 31-3, Siurla-Theodoridou 20, 132-5, 198, 222.
[7] Alexiou 7-8, Garland 34-9, 104-5.

deceased (e.g. processing of the body, social transition from living to dead accomplished by lament) and on the social negotiations between the survivors (e.g. activities of reciprocity, changing social roles of the bereaved). Similarly, the inscribed epigram represents a reactive verbal expression and an active constitution of the gravesite, which focuses on the dead by verbally and iconographically defining their stable-dead identity and on the living community by recording the identity of the deceased, the mourners, and the social negotiations and reciprocity taking place during death ritual. Within the framework of funerary ritual as described above, the fusion of material and verbal memorial in the inscribed grave marker extends the expressive opportunities available to the mourner, by functioning as an enduring artifact of completed mourning, as a document of social relationships, and finally as a historical record.

After the advent of writing, the lament continues to be performed in professional and private formats alongside the epigram. The few later and fragmentary θρῆνοι of Pindar and Simonides exemplify the persistence of professional lament[8]; as these laments follow the epigram and the spread of writing at the gravesite chronologically, I will treat them after my discussion of the archaic epigrams. Other than these fragments of the θρῆνοι, we have no other extant fragments or written representations of lament performed by relatives of the deceased in the archaic period. Nonetheless, the personal lament remains visible, reflected within archaic funerary legislation and within other poetic genres; there is likewise evidence for lament in contexts outside private and kinship circles – ritual lament in cult, forced mourning in wartime contexts, and lament at the state burials of rulers.[9]

Although our written sources for archaic lament are limited in the archaic period, some elegiac authors thematize the private lament. Elegy represents grief as feminine (γυναικεῖον πένθος, Archil. 13.10 W) and urges the audience to endure it (τλημοσύνην 13.6, τλῆτε 13.10). The poetry of the living still views mourning as an essential part of the passage of the dead and of the life cycle of human beings:

> [Plut. *Publ.* 24.5: πρὸς Μίμνερμον ἀνειπὼν περὶ χρόνου ζωῆς ἐπιπεφώνηκε·]
> μηδέ μοι ἄκλαυτος θάνατος μόλοι, ἀλλὰ φίλοισι
> καλλείποιμι θανὼν ἄλγεα καὶ στοναχάς (Sol. fr. 21W).

[8] A. E. Harvey, 'The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry,' *CQ* 5 n.s. (1955): 168-170.
[9] For ritual lament, see Sappho 140 LP. For forced mourning, see Tyrtaeus 6-7 W. On lament at state burials, see Hdt. 6.58.

Mourning represents the sole interchange that concerns the deceased; the dead are otherwise disconnected from the reciprocity that characterizes the community of the living:

> οὔτις αἰδοῖος μετ' ἀστῶν οὐδὲ περίφημος θανὼν
> γίνεται. χάριν δὲ μᾶλλον τοῦ ζοοῦ διώκομεν
> ⟨οἱ⟩ ζοοί, κάκιστα δ' αἰεὶ τῷ θανόντι γίνεται. (Archil. fr. 133[10])

Despite the consistently ambiguous position occupied by lament, the elegiac adhortations to warriors especially recall the lament-σῆμα-κλέος constellation of Homeric mourning when they emphasize the special mourning performed for those who die in battle, extending from lament and the burial site to cultural memory:

> τὸν δ' *ὀλοφύρονται* μὲν ὁμῶς νέοι καὶ γέροντες
> ἀργαλέῳ δὲ πόθῳ πᾶσα κέκηδε πόλις
> καὶ *τύμβος* καὶ παῖδες ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀρίσημοι
> καὶ παίδων παῖδες καὶ γένος ἐξοπίσω.
> οὐδέ ποτε *κλέος* ἐσθλὸν ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' *ὄνομ'* αὐτοῦ
> ἀλλ' ὑπὸ γῆς περ ἐὼν γίνεται ἀθάνατος
> ὅντιν' ἀριστεύοντα μένοντά τε μαρνάμενόν τε
> γῆς πέρι καὶ παίδων θοῦρος Ἄρης ὀλέσῃ.
> (Tyrt. 12.27-34W, cf. Kallin. 1.14-21W).

Elegy reveals the persistence of lament as a communicative genre that preserves the significance of individual activity beyond death; it also indicates the lament's continued close association with the gravesite and with poetic κλέος as contemporary and perhaps competing genres of memory.

The elegiac characterization of lament retains both this Homeric triad lament-σῆμα-κλέος, as well as the characterization of lament or grief as female, passive, and subordinate to other activities. Elegy also highlights the preoccupation of lament with the supranormal death (e.g. Archil. 11 and 13 on the death of his brother-in-law at sea) and in particular with

[10] Bonnie MacLachlan, *The Age of Grace: Charis in Early Greek Poetry* (Princeton, 1993) 73-4; cf. Stesichoros fr. 245, Soph. *Ajax* 1266-7 for similar themes.

[11] See also S. Lonsdale, *Dance and Ritual Play in Greek Religion* (Baltimore, 1993) 243-4 on the general similarities between lament for the dead and other musical performance (e.g. wedding songs), which nonetheless strongly differentiates itself from lament. A case in point is the Homeric poems, which, while characterizing the performance of the bard as a source of τέρψις, also use the verb τέρπεσθαι of taking pleasure in the γόος (*Od.* 4.102 [Menelaus], 194 [Peisistratus], 11.212 [Odysseus and his mother in Hades], 19.213, 251, 513, 21.57 [Penelope]), which is elsewhere portrayed as passive or negative.

the warrior's 'beautiful' death, which is imagined as an essential part of his life cycle. In its sympotic context, elegy characterizes lament as the contrast and foil for the τέρψις of its own performance:

> οὔτέ τι γὰρ κλαίων ἰήσομαι, οὔτε κάκιον
> θήσω τερπωλὰς καὶ θαλίας ἐφέπων (Archil. 11W)
>
> κήδεα μὲν στονόεντα Περίκλεες οὔτέ τις ἀστῶν
> μεμφόμενος θαλίῃς τέρψεται οὐδὲ πόλις (Archil. 13.1-2W).[11]

Contrary to any traditional or theoretical associations of elegy with lament[12], delight (τέρψις) is a central aim of elegiac performance; τέρψις is associated in epic, lyric, elegiac, and epinician genres with youth (especially in contrast with age and death)[13], and exchange among the living: χάρις, feasts, drinking, the enjoyment of wealth, sexual union, gift exchange, social belonging, and musical or verbal communication.[14] The elegiac tradition thus imagines τέρψις as a pleasurable activity or existence engaged in by a vital and living person and as a state which concludes

---

[12] Other than the passages cited in the discussion below, cf. Theognis 1069-70 and 1203-6, which also suggest the persistence of personal lament at the gravesite.

M. L. West (*Studies in Greek elegy and iambus* (Berlin, 1974) 7-13, 103-116) and others have argued that elegy originates from lament, but there is little to support this theory: see E. L. Bowie, 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival,' *JHS* 106 (1986): 13-35. As Bowie demonstrates, ἔλεγος is first used explicitly of 'lament' in the late fifth century BCE. In addition, there are very few extant elegies with a theme of lament in the archaic period. Archil. 11 and 13W are the exceptions, but as we see here, they privilege the activities of the symposium over mourning (Bowie 22-7).

[13] Alc. Fr. 73.9, Mimnermus 1.8, 2.4, 5.3, Pindar *Ol.* 6.57, Theog. 567.

[14] χάρις / the Χάριτες: Pindar *Ol.* 9.28, 14.5, *Isthm.* 3/4.90b, Fr. 95.5.

feasting / drinking: Hes. *Th.* 917, *WD* 115; Hom. *Il.* 11.643, *Od.* 1.26, 258, 369, 8.429, 542, 11.603, 13.27, 14.443, 15.391, 399; Pindar *Ol.* 10.76; Theog. 778, 984, 1047.

enjoyment of wealth / possessions: Hom. *Il.* 9.337, 400, 23. 298.

gift-giving: Hes. *WD* 358; Hom. *Od.* 8.429.

social belonging: Hom. *Od.* 4.179, 13.61.

sexual union / Aphrodite: Hes. *Th.* 206; Hom. *Od.* 5.227, 18.315; Mimnermus 1.1; Pindar *P.* 9.66, *Nem.* 7.53; Theog. 256, 1345.

verbal communication: Archil. Fr. 168.4; Hom. *Il.* 11.643, *Od.* 4.239, 598, 15.393, 399, 23.301, 308; Pindar Fr. 52o.34; Theogn. 1047.

musical performance: Hes. *Th.* 37, 51, 917, *WD* 487; Hom. *Il.* 1.474, 9.186, 18.526, 604; *Od.* 1.347, 422, 423, 8.45, 91, 368, 12.52, 188, 13.27, 17.385, 606, 18.305-6; Theog. 778, 791, 975.

τέρψις is likewise associated with leisurely activities (cf. *Od.* 21.105), such as throwing the discus (Hom. *Il.* 2.774, *Od.* 4.626, 17.168) or observing something of aesthetic value, such as dance (*Il.* 18.604), an attractive or desirable person (*Od.* 8.171, 16.26, Mimnermus 5.3) or well-crafted armor (*Il.* 19.18); compare here the Homeric characterization of the gods in general (*Od.* 6.46, 104) and in particular of the gods taking pleasure in watching human events: *Il.* 4.10, 5.760, 7.61, 20.23.

with age and death.[15] The elegiac strategy of contrasting lament and sympotic τέρψις parallels epic's characterization of the γόος as an inverse κλέος, an idea rooted in the imagination of death as the end of the warrior's activity; the pleasureable activity surrounding the elegiac performance stands in opposition to the lament as marker of death, which represents the end of activity, and thus, by definition, of τέρψις.

Together with the generic marginalization of lament within the poetic tradition, funerary legislation is a central factor in the changes to lament in the archaic period. Funerary legislation controls economic expenditure on death ritual as well as the modes of mourning; it variously outlaws precomposed lament (τὸ θρηνεῖν πεποιημένα Plut. *Sol.* 21.6), limits performance contexts for lament, and regulates participant numbers according to their relationship to the deceased. Scholarly opinion about the function of funerary legislation is divided. Some studies argue that funerary legislation is sociopolitically motivated – that it curbs the influence of rich aristocratic clans[16], that it regulates the grave sites essential for legitimation of property[17], or that it diverts the potentially disruptive elements of anger and revenge inherent in funeral rites into civic contexts.[18] Other scholars adopt the problematic argument that rising individualism creates a new discomfort with death which legislation attempts to ease by minimizing the visibility of funerals.[19] By controlling the destruction and non-use of objects dedicated to the dead, funerary legislation could also represent a conservation of collective resources.[20] Whatever the initial motivation(s) of funerary legislation may have been, their result is that the polis appropriates many activities formerly associated with the private funeral and integrates them into statewide mourning festivals and hero cult. The polis thus promotes political solidarity by controlling and appropriating aspects of the private ceremony, such as intramural burial, perpetual mourning, and mourning in non-kin formations. This social control exerted on death

---

[15] Hom. *Il.* 8.481, Mimnermus 1.8, Pindar *Ol.* 10.93, Theogn. 975; the exception is the warrior who survives his days as a soldier and so is honored by enjoying τερπνά in his old age (Tyrt. 12.38).

[16] Alexiou 17-19, Garland *Greek Way of Death* 22.

[17] Morris *Burial* 50-3.

[18] Robert Garland, 'The well-ordered corpse: an investigation into the motives behind Greek funerary legislation,' *BICS* 36 (1989): 1-15, esp. 15; Richard Seaford, *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State* (Oxford, 1994) 82-9.

[19] Sourvinou-Inwood 293-4, 418-440; cf. Garland 'The well-ordered corpse,' 1 and 14 on legislation as a means of controlling pollution. For a critique of this argument, see Ian Morris, 'Attitudes Toward Death in Archaic Greece,' *ClasAnt* 8.2 (1989): 296-320.

[20] Baudy 205, Garland 'The well-ordered corpse' 2, 15.

ritual and the generic marginalization of lament is matched by an increasing adaptation or replacement of lament by other genres accessible primarily to male participants in a male or civic context – the skolion lament for Harmodios and Aristogeiton, literary epitaphs such as those of Simonides, elegy in its traditional association with and thematization of lament, and the civic funeral oration accompanying, if not replacing, lament at the gravesite.[21]

In oral-traditional, oral-derived, and written evidence, the gravemarker or grave stele is attested side by side with lament, and is found in the archaeological record from the geometric period onward[22], with the first figured and inscribed stelai appearing in the seventh century.[23] Stelai are outstanding monuments during this period because of the financial cost of commissioning a stele on a limited basis, a fact which only changes in the later fifth and fourth centuries BCE, when greater wealth and mass production of stelai make them generally more accessible.[24] The earliest extant inscriptions are hexametric and concentrated in the regions of Corinth and Corcyra, while the increased corpus of sixth-century epigrams is primarily elegiac and centered in Athens.[25] The archaic epigram normally appears on a base bearing a statue on the base or more rarely on the body of a stele, which in Attica was first topped by a sphinx and later by single or paired volutes ending in a palmette.[26] From the end of the sixth century BCE, the extant private grave monuments decrease radically in Athens at the same time that public funerary monuments come into prominence; this decrease in private monuments is perhaps to be traced to the funerary legislation dated by Cicero (*Leges* 2.65) to the period after Solon's legislation but before Demetrius of Phaleron's regulation of funerary expression (317/6BCE).[27] This decrease in Athenian grave monuments could also be attributed to the chaos of the Persian Wars, during which elite groups might forgo funerary ostentation; the fact that private memorials outside of Attica increase during this period (particularly in the late sixth-century Attic style of a tall, thin stele topped by a finial with a

---

[21] Alexiou 102-8.
[22] K. F. Johansen, *The Attic Grave Reliefs of the Classical Period* (Copenhagen, 1951) 66-9.
[23] Johansen 73, Lausberg 102.
[24] G. M. A. Richter, *The Archaic Gravestones of Attica* (London, 1961): 1.
[25] Lausberg 102, 105-6.
[26] Lausberg 118, Richter 2.
[27] Lausberg 122-3 argues that Cicero's mention of this law regulating praise of the deceased could well mean written praise in the form of epigrams: nec de mortui laude nisi in publicis sepulturis nec ab alio nisi qui publice ad eam rem constitutus esset dici licebat (*Leges* 2.65).

pair of volutes ending in a palmette) suggests an emigration of Athenian artisans to other locations until the late fifth century, when the Periclean building program begins and the construction of grave stelai resumes.[28] When the private monument reemerges, it maintains the format of two- to four-line elegiacs, typologizing verbal and pictorial portraiture, and various archaic motifs. The fifth-century monuments feature more personal and familial detail, including more epigrams for women, and new formats, such as the separation of the deceased's name from the metrical epigram, a development which preserves the metrical integrity of the verse but moves away from the initial prominence of the name on the σῆμα.[29] From the late fifth century, Athenian monuments become increasingly complex until the funerary legislation of Demetrius of Phaleron (317/6BCE) canonizes three conventional types of grave monument, the most common of which was the columella; with the renewed regulation of funerary expression, expanded epigrams are most often supplanted by a simple inscription of the name of the deceased in the Hellenistic period.[30] Although the design and placement of grave markers in Athens and other poleis differ from each other, the texts and function of the grave markers remain similar in that all serve the same primary function of linking the deceased's identity with the gravesite and all relate to a commonly accessible poetic and iconographic referentiality in communicating this information through the inscribed epigram.[31]

The archaic epigram epitomizes the new position of mourning and memorialization within the culture of oralcy; while responding to the tensions present in traditional mourning, it also embraces the new possibilities offered by writing. Like other early uses of writing to mark objects as property[32], the funerary inscription's essential function is to link the deceased's name and identity with the physical remains of the deceased buried at the site.[33] The primary role of the inscribed gravemarker as a

---

[28] Richter 53-5.

[29] Lausberg 136-142.

[30] Lausberg 144.

[31] Below, my discussion will attempt to avoid Athenocentrism by incorporating texts from various geographical regions, despite the proportionately greater number of sources available from Attica.

[32] L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries B. C.* (Oxford, 1961) 61-2, cf. the Nestor cup.

[33] Cf. Ecker 45-6, 119, 121-2, 143-4; see Sourvinou-Inwood 147-151, 279 on the various formulae of the archaic grave inscription. In the case of a cenotaph (of which no archaic examples are known to me), the inscribed cenotaph would serve to create a social site for the deceased within the appropriate community and thus to mediate the extraordinary circumstances in which the body is absent and cannot be retrieved.

record of the name of the deceased binds it to the context of the gravesite, outside of which it lacks meaning; in context, the gravestone may also imply the identity of those who erected the monument, as well as the appropriate action to be taken by the reader.[34] Häusle (114-130) discusses the use of different cases of names in various geographical areas, each of which represents a distinct mode of expression. The nominative treats the name as significant per se, as a representation of the dead, as a caption for a pictorial representation of the deceased, or as an abbreviation for the formula 'X ἔνθαδε κεῖται.' The genitive emphasizes the deceased's possession of the monument; the basic formula of the genitive with τόδε σῆμα is already present in Homeric epic, either referring to extant monuments contemporary to this performance of the epic or perhaps itself serving as a model for the expression in the epigrams: ἀνδρὸς μὲν τόδε σῆμα πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος (*Il.* 7.89 [Hector's σῆμα]). Häusle suggests that the preference for the genitive in Attica might stem from the central role of the Athenian family gravesite in determining the property rights of the living. The dative emphasizes the dedication of the monument to the deceased, while the accusative probably serves as an abbreviation of various different formulae, such as 'X buried Y here,' or 'the earth covers X here.' Finally, the vocative most likely represents a final greeting or address directed at the deceased.

Beyond simpler inscriptions consisting solely of the name of the deceased, the typical epigram begins with a syntactically complete phrase connecting the name of the deceased with the σῆμα defining the gravesite ('Vorstellung'), followed by more detailed and specific information centered on one event that characterizes the deceased ('nähere Angabe'): the means of death, the deceased's social position, or the identity of the donor of the monument.[35] While the Homeric σῆμα could lapse into ambiguity

---

[34] Helmut Häusle, *Einfache und frühe Formen des griechischen Epigramms* [*Commentationes Aenipontanae* XXV] (Innsbruck, 1979) 60. A similar case worth comparing is that of the horoi, whose possible functions as boundary of religious areas, as well as economic (e.g. hypothecation), political (e.g. interstate boundaries) or social (e.g. areas blocked to certain members of society) status of land are contingent upon their location as much as on the irretrievable interpretative consensus of the contemporary inhabitants. Changes in location and in the consensus regarding signification of the horos alter its social function for the reader; just as with the horoi (often marked solely with the word ΟΡΟΣ), the inscribed gravemarker identifies or implies the meaning of its location (boundary, grave), the donor of the monument, and the prescribed or appropriate action for a knowledgeable reader within the society. See Josiah Ober, 'Greek Horoi: Artifactual Texts and the Contingency of Meaning,' in David B. Small, ed., *Methods in the Mediterranean: Historical and Archaeological Views on Texts and Archaeology* (Leiden, 1995): 91-123.

[35] Lausberg 104, 106-7.

without written demarcation, the archaic introduction of writing enables the σῆμα to communicate diachronically, while also necessitating that the preserved message remain relevant and accessible to the collective memory (πολοῖς μνᾶμα καὶ | [ἐσ]ομένοις, CEG 136.2).

As the epigrams themselves point out, the performance situation and therefore the effectiveness of the epigram are spatially limited; the epigrams are replete with deictics, and often refer to the nearby stance of the reader or the roadside placement of the monument.[36] With this spatial limitation, the success of the grave complex stems from its initial visual impact which motivates the passerby to stop and read the monument:

> ἄνθροπε hòστείχε[ι]ς·: καθ' οδὸ|ν : φρασὶν : ἄλα μενοινο̑ν,·
> στε̑θι | καὶ οἴκτιρον : σε̑μα Θράσονος : ἰδόν
> (CEG 28, Attica, ca. 540-530?)
>
> Fellow mortal, you who are approaching on the road, intent on other things in your mind,
> stand and take pity, seeing the σῆμα of Thrason.

The communication of the σῆμα is thus rooted in visual contact; the passerby preoccupied with other thoughts (hòστείχε[ι]ς... φρασὶν : ἄλα μενοινο̑ν) comes to a standstill and turns his vision (ἰδόν) and attention to the deceased (στε̑θι | καὶ οἴκτιρον).[37] The verbal and visual message of the grave complex is imagined as initiating physical and psychological change in its reader: γνό|[σετ]αι (CEG 19.2), [δάκρυ κ]άταρ[χ]σον (CEG 34.2). The grave epigram thus offers new communicative possibilities through its fusion of verbal and material memorial; the essential characteristics of

---

[36] Deictics in grave epigram: ἐνθάδε CEG 40.1, 53, 137.1; τόδε σε̑μα / μνε̑μα CEG 14.1, 16.1, 23, 26.1, 29i-ii, 31.3, 32.1, 35-38, 39.1, 41, 42i.1, 46.1, 50.1, 51.1, 52i.1, 60-2, 65.1, 71, 106, 138.1, 139.1, 140, 143.1, 145.1, 157, 169.1; τόνδ' οἶ?[ον] 152; cf. Ecker 51.
proximity of reader and stele: CEG 27.1 στε̑θι... Κροίσο | παρὰ σε̑μα θανόντος, 34: ['Α]ντιλόχο : ποτὶ σε̑μ' ἀγαθο̑... / [δάκρυ κ]άταρ[χ]σον.
roadside placement of the stele (ἐνγὺς ho|δοῖ CEG 16.2, hoστείχε[ι]ς: καθ' ὀδό|ν 28.1, ἐνγὺ|ς hoδο̑ 39.1, ⟨ἐ⟩ν⟨γ⟩ὺς ὀδο̑ 74.1); placement of σῆμα near a hippodrome ([π]έλας hιπoδρόμοιο CEG 136.1).

[37] Stopping / standing still: στε̑θι (CEG 27.1, 28.1).
Viewing : προσιδόν (CEG 19.2), ἰδόν (28.2), ἰδε῀ν (46.1), προσορο̑[ν] (51.1), ἐσορο̑ν (68.2), cf. 161, where the monument is dedicated because the relative will no longer see the deceased: ἦ καλὸν τὸ μνῆμα [πα]|τὴρ ἔστησε Θανόσ[ηι]|Λεαρέτηι· οὐ γὰρ [ἔτ]|ι ζῶσαν ἐσοφσόμ[εθα]. Pitying or mourning: οἴκτιρον (CEG 27.1, 51.1, 68.2); on these epigrams see Ecker 151, 158-162,172-3. In keeping with this primarily visual purpose of the grave as described in epigram, eighth- and seventh-century Greek grave sites concentrate on outward appearances, including a marker, mound, built tombs, or sculpture, while the actual interior of the grave is often modestly or not at all furnished; see Donna C. Kurtz and John Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs* (London, 1971): 75.

the epigram as written text are its limited spatial effectiveness and its diachronic durability – as we shall see below, these two aspects will shape its negotiation between private and public, individual and collective, and oral and written emphases.

In the culture of oralcy, the written inscription records the ephemeral verbal acts of mourning in response to death: τόδε σε̃μα πατὲρ ἔστε[σε....]... ὀ | λοφυρόμενος (CEG 14).[38] The burial site is to be understood as the third component of reaggregation or reincorporation of Van Gennep's transitional theory; it has both the metaphysical function of recording the integration of the deceased into the group of stable dead as well as the social aim of reorienting the group to which he or she belonged.[39] As an inscribed object, the σῆμα generates this additional diachronic meaning for the gravesite by preserving the results of the immediate oral, ritual, or social interchange among the mourners for public transmission across generations.[40] Despite this new public function, the inscribed grave marker is not associated with the community at large, but with the deceased elite; the language, iconography, and simply the prohibitive cost of the grave marker reflect its roots in the elite.[41] Similar in some respects to the Homeric representations of mourning, where heroes alone qualify for lament, burial, and epic commemoration, the archaic burials encompass a small and choice group buried according to age, activity, and elite status. The elite aspect of the epigram lies not only in its demarcation of social differences, but also in its long-term differentiation between elite and others; it assures that individual memory and family genealogy persist diachronically and so reinforces the elite position.[42] While the epigram

---

[38] For other instances where the act of mourning is commemorated in the epigram, see also CEG 43.5 (ὀλ]οφύρομαι hόνεκ' ἄho[ρος]) and 139.2 (...[τ]οῦτο δ' ἑταῖροι | σᾶμα χέαν βαρέα στενάχοντες).

[39] W. Enniger and Ch. Schwens, 'Friedhöfe als kulturelle Texte,' *Zeitschrift für Semiotik* 11 (1989): 135-181, especially 150-2.

[40] Ecker 233 argues that the epigram's disengagement of the memorialization of the dead from oral and private interchange means that the inscribed gravemarker functions as a public message with collective relevance. In view of the barriers to universal literacy as well as the sheer cost and limited accessibility of the grave stele, the public presence of the σῆμα hardly necessitates an unconditional, immediate transition to collective relevance and acceptance of the inscribed memorial.

[41] See M. B. Wallace, 'Notes on early Greek grave epigrams,' *Phoenix* 24 (1970): 95-105, on the generally exceptional and therefore aristocratic nature of the decorated stele with a verse epitaph. See also Morris *Burial* 9ff. on the vacillation between exclusively aristocratic and general usage of burial areas in Athens.

[42] Seen for example in the determination of Athenian property rights according to Athenian citizenship, which was itself proven by existence of familial gravesites (Morris *Burial* 53).

records the societal position of the deceased, it also memorializes the social relationships surrounding the construction of the monument – between the deceased and their relatives, ἑταῖροι, or the δῆμος.[43] The grave marker may feature typologizing portraits of the deceased as adult male (bearded man) or youth (beardless kouros) in active poses as athlete (naked) or symposiast (draped figure) or as a woman in more static poses as wife (with spindle) or as unwed maiden (kore with birds or flowers); these stylized figures function less to personify the deceased than to preserve their social persona.[44] Spatial relations within burial sites likewise communicate the social persona of the deceased visually – supra-normal (heroes, distinguished warriors) and infranormal (suicides, unwed youth) deceased are separated from the rest according to their extraordinary status.[45] The verbal components of the archaic gravesites likewise communicate the deceased's social status at the transitional moments of death and burial.[46] Thus, the sheer effect of the inscribed grave marker, with the potential for further demarcation through a burial mound, iconography, or spatial

[43] father (CEG 14.1, 25.1, 41.1, 53, 71, 113.1, 137.1, 152), mother (25.2, 33.2, 35, 43.3, 61.2, 138.1, 157, 169.1), sister (37), daughter (54.1), children (57.1, 61.2, 111.1); citizens (58.3, 143.2-6); ἑταῖροι (139.2, 164.2).

[44] Sourvinou-Inwood 221-270 passim. This correspondence between funerary iconography and social persona of the deceased is hardly binary; for example, a kore may stand over the grave of a male youth, reflecting abstract values rather than an exact iconographic correspondence (228, 245). This typological iconography lies at the heart of the function of the visual μνῆμα – the memorialization of the *social persona*, rather than of the individual. Cf. Day 17-22 and R. G. Osborne, 'Death revisited, death revised: the death of the artist in archaic and classical Greece,' *Art History* 11 (1988): 1-16, who argues that the usage of the kouros solely for gravesites and funerary dedications underlines the generic nature of its representation; while the dedicatory kouros represents all worshippers to the god, the funerary kouros portrays the deceased as a social type (6-7). Cf. also H. A. Shapiro, 'The Iconography of Mourning in Athenian Art,' *AJA* 95 (1991): 629-656, who surveys the various archaic media at the grave site – pinakes, black and early red-figure loutrophoroi and other specialized vase shapes, funerary statue and carved grave stelai. The carved stele and the statue have typologized portrayals with occasional individual details in the former. Plaques and loutrophoroi tend to depict the prothesis (laying-out of the corpse), a scene which varies only in details; the largest variations in these media occur in the cases of male youths, where subsidiary scenes supplement the depiction of the prothesis with portrayals of aristocratic or fictive heroic activity, such as charioteers or funeral games.

[45] Bremmer *Early Greek Concept of the Soul* 96-105, CEG 24, 43, 45, 75; cf. CEG 138 (οὐ γὰρ παῖδες ἐνὶ μεγάροις ἐγένοντο), Carm. Conv. 1 PMG, and on the theme of the ἄωρος θάνατος, cf. E. Griessmair, *Das Motiv der Mors Immatura in den griechischen metrischen Grabinschriften* (Innsbruck, 1966) and Ecker 200.

[46] e.g. CEG 14, 18, 32, 40, 42, 46, 51, 60, 68, 138, 169 παῖδα / -ός/ -í; 13, 16, 19, 34, 36 ἀνδρός; 19 αἰχμετô, 24 κόρε, 43 Ὀλυνπιόνικος, 47 ἀνέρ... ἐρα[σ] | θίς, 57, 111 πατρί, 58 μετέοικον (cf. 66), 62 ἰατρô, 76 ναυτίλον, 143 πρόξενος; cf. Ecker 165-7 and Morris *Burial* 110, 128, 137 on the variation in numbers of social personae according to general frequency of burial, age structure and adult group sizes of cemeteries.

positioning, signifies the status and social persona of the deceased within the local group.

The majority of extant archaic epigrams mark the extraordinary burials of younger people, warriors, and those dying in unusual circumstances at sea or away from their homeland. The predominance of this motif in the archaic epigrams suggests that the extraordinary death functions less as a recurring trope than as a determinant of which burials are marked by script; the inscribed epigram would then represent not only an indicator of social status, but also a visual and verbal medium that mediates the special liminality of the extraordinary death. Although the significance of the epigram and the form of the grave marker cannot be consistently coordinated[47], the epigram refers to the monument's visual efficacy while it also serves as a verbal label and complement to the iconographic representation of the deceased: μνε̑μ' ἐσορο̑ν οἴκτιρ' ὁς καλὸς ὂν ἔθανε (CEG 68.2).[48] Both script and icon reflect status in life and in death, preserving the result of the ritual and social transition through visual and verbal referentiality; the deceased's social status thus remains readable and collectively accessible through multiple readings, beyond communicative to cultural memory.[49]

2.1 *Stand and Take Pity: The Epigram at the Gravesite*

The epigram represents a new type of communication at the gravesite which supplements rather than replaces lament. While the Homeric γόος treats the deceased as its object, with the mourner addressing the deceased in the second person, the epigram provides a medium of communication among a broadened spectrum of participants: between mourner and deceased, deceased and reader, and even monument and reader. While Homeric lament allows elaboration and multiple allusion to the social environment within an audience of kin or acquaintances, the epigram is

[47] Day 20-1, G. Pfohl, 'Das anonyme Epigramm. Methoden der Erschliessung poetischer Inschriften, dargestellt am Model der griechischen Grabinschriften,' *Euphrosyne* N. S. 4 (1970): 73-112, especially 82-9 on the problematic relationship between pictorial representation and epigram, the difficulty in identifying the deceased in pictorial representations, as well as the possibilities of multiple gravestones over a single deceased, multiple names on a single stele, and / or inscriptions engraved over one another over time.

[48] H. R. Hastings, *On the relation between inscriptions and sculptured representations on Attic tombstones* [*Bulletin of the UWisconsin* 485, Philology and Literature Series 5.2] (Madison, WI, 1912) 108-110.

[49] See Sourvinou-Inwood 293-4, 418, 429-31.

necessarily shorter through its spatial limitations and, because of its durability, must adapt its message to the larger, non-kin community. I begin by examining several examples of the different formats of the grave epigram, analyzing their negotiation between oral and written, between synchronic and diachronic, and between individual, kin, and collective emphases. As I will show below, the nature of the epigrams as durable written texts in the spatially limited context of the gravesite defines their expanded function, in which they communicate in traditional referential terms and address the problems of mourning thematized in the Homeric poems, yet also mark the new role of the material memorial as an aesthetic object, a behavioral paradigm, a sign of reciprocity, and a historical document.

The archaic grave epigram can appear in first, second, and third person formats. Chronologically, the earliest epigrams down to 600 BCE are generally composed in the first person, while around 550-540 BCE the third person becomes predominant.[50] The predominance of the first person in the earliest epigrams suggests their initial dependence on oral rhetoric in negotiating between oral and written expression in the culture of oralcy; the σῆμα's first-person communication is rooted in the absence of the author of the message and the presence of the stone as medium of communication with the reader, which takes on the first person in the author's place but never carries out a speech act acceptable in an oral context.[51] The grave epigram appears in the first person in various forms, in which either the σῆμα or the deceased speaks to the reader. Normally, the speaking persona of the σῆμα is marked by the phrase, 'X erected (or made) me,' 'I am the stele of X,' or the like:

> Εὐμάρες με πατὲρ 'Ανδροκλέ | ος ἐντάδε σᾶμα
> ποι | ϝέσανς καταέθεκε | φίλο μνᾶμα hυιέος 'εμ | εν.
> (CEG 137, Methana, ca. 600?)
> Eumares, father of Androkles, making me, the σῆμα here,
> set me up to be a memorial of his beloved son.

It is in the archaic period that the word μνῆμα as well as σῆμα becomes associated with the grave marker, reflecting its shift in function from signification of the grave's location to a more active generation and preservation of the deceased's memory.[52]

---

[50] Svenbro 29-37.
[51] e.g. 'X made me.' Cf. Svenbro 16n.41, 30-1, 44.
[52] Sourvinou-Inwood 140-1. Cf. the comparably important role of memory for Homeric lament, especially with κλαυθμός *Il.* 19.338-9 (Achilles and the elders mourn), 24.509-512

The material σῆμα constructed by the mourner transmits memory in its personified form and so represents a μνῆμα, a vehicle for memory:

> δακρυόεν πολυπενθὲς Ἀναχσίλα ἐδ' ὀλοφ | υδνὸν
> λάινον ἕστεκα μνε̃μα καταφθιμέ | {με}νο·
> Ναχσίο ὂν τίεσκον Ἀθεναι̃οι μετέοικον
> ἔχ | σοχα σοφροσύνες ἕνεκεν ἐδ' ἀρετε̃ς. :
> τοι μ' ἐπὶ Τιμ | όμαχος γεραρὸν κτέρας οἷα θανόντι
> θε̃κεν Ἀ | ρίστονος παιδὶ χαριζόμενος. (CEG 58, Attica, ca. 510-500?)
> As the tearful, exceedingly sorrowful, and mournful
> stone memorial of the deceased Anaxilas, I stand [here].
> A Naxian metic, the Athenians honored him
> because of his outstanding moderation and excellence.
> Timomachos set me up for the deceased as a reverent funeral honor, gratifying the son of Ariston.

This epigram emphasizes the mediating role of the monument, which fuses visual (δακρυόεν), psychological (πολυπενθὲς) and verbal (ὀλοφ | υδνὸν) components of mourning.[53] The construction of the monument likewise links the past honor of the deceased (τίεσκον, 3) in the third person with the μνῆμα at the gravesite, which continually mediates the ephemeral honor and memorialization of the dead to the reader in the first-person present.

There are further variations on the first-person epigram, in which the deceased speaks or where the writer and perhaps even the reader address the deceased. It is very seldom that the archaic epigram represents the speech of the deceased addressing the reader:

> [ὅ]στις μὴ παρ[ε | τ]ύνχαν' ὅτ' ἐ[χσ] | έφερόν με θαν | όντα,
> νυ̃ν μ' ὀ[λο] | φυράσθω. μν[ῆμ] | α δὲ Τηλεφ[άνε] | ος.
> (CEG 159, Thasos, ca. 500?)
> Whoever was not present when they carried me out, dead,
> now let him mourn me. The memorial of Telephanes.

In this epigram, the reader who was not present at the ekphora is told to mourn the deceased upon reading the μνῆμα and thus to recreate the ritual.

(Achilles and Priam mourn together, each remembering his own loss), *Od.* 4.186-9 (Peisistratus remembers and mourns Antilochos as others mourn Odysseus).

[53] While δακρυόεις refers to the external visual mark of tears, πολυπένθης indicates an internal state (*Il.* 9.563 [Alkyone], *Od.* 14.386 [Eumaeus on Odysseus], 23.15 [Penelope on her own θυμός]) and ὀλοφυδνός most often prefaces speech (ἔπος): *Il.* 5.683 (wounded Sarpedon speaking), 23.102 (Achilles speaks with the ghost of Patroclus), *Od.* 19.362 (Eurycleia speaks with the disguised Odysseus).

The motif of the absence of kin at the death or burial of a loved one is a traditional motif; epic characterizes the situation of various figures who remain away from their homeland and consequently miss the death or funeral of family members as particularly negative.[54] With its allusion to the incomplete mourning of the dead, this epigram suggests that the rarity of the dead addressing the living in epigram is connected with the monument's nature as the product of completed death ritual; the completed ritual and the monument as its artifact signal the integration of the deceased into the stable dead and the end of their interchange with the living community.

Yet in some cases, the epigram could represent either the speech of the σῆμα or of the deceased him/herself, suggesting a close association between the monument and the deceased or perhaps merely an intensification of the 'talking stone' persona:

> i. σε̑μα Φρασικλείας. | κόρε κεκλέσομαι | αἰεί,
> ἀντὶ γάμο | παρὰ θεο̂ν τοῦτο | λαχο̂σ' ὄνομα.
> ii. 'Αριστίον Πάρι[ος μ' ἐπ]ο[ίε]σε.
> (CEG 24, Attica, ca. 540?)
> The σῆμα of Phrasikleia. I will be called maiden forever,
> having gotten the name as my lot from the gods instead of marriage.
> Aristion of Paros made me.

The parallel between marriage and death stems from the position of marriage as the definitive female rite of passage, which stands in analogy with death ritual as a rite of passage. This association between death and marriage – both death as the loss of marriage and death ritual as analogy for or substitute for marriage – is already present in the prominence of marriage as the definitive link between the female mourner and the dead hero in the Homeric γόοι; the motif also persists in the epigrams and in Attic tragedy, as we shall see in the reading of Sophocles' *Antigone* below.[55] The

---

[54] οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακώτερον ἄλλο πάθοιμι
οὐδ' εἰ κεν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀποφθιμένοιο πυθοίμην,
ὅς που νῦν Φθίηφι τέρεν κατὰ δάκρυον εἴβει
χήτεϊ τοιοῦδ' υἱός. ὁ δ' ἀλλοδαπῷ ἐνὶ δήμῳ
εἵνεκα ῥιγεδανῆς Ἑλένης Τρωσὶν πολεμίζω (*Il.* 19.322-5 [Achilles])
cf. Helen and the Dioscouroi *Il.* 3.234-244, Andromache and Hector *Il.* 22.437-467, Odysseus and his mother *Od.* 11.170-3.

[55] Death and marriage form two similar ritual passages available to the young unmarried woman. The various parallels between marriage and death ritual include verbal exchange (makarismos), ritual action (cutting the hair, ritual bath, covering of the body, movement into or out of a house), ritual artifacts (the loutrophoros and the lekythos, both with funerary and marital uses) and the vase iconography of the two rituals (torches, carts, loutrophoroi or lebetes, ribbons, crowns, veils, quinces or pomegranates). See Rush

gods' distribution of the alternative destinies of marriage and death remains impersonally characterized as a distribution by lot (λαχὸσῷ 24i.2). As in the Homeric γόοι, the gods rarely play an explicit role in the death of the individual; elsewhere among the archaic epigrams, we find soldiers' deaths attributed to Ares in metonymic fashion (CEG 27.2, 145.2) or death referred to as Hades' realm (ἄhορα παθὸν δόματ' ἐ | [βα]ς 'Αίδα, CEG 163), showing a general absence of references to the gods outside of common poetic tropes such as these. As Svenbro has noted, the κ alliteration of the first line links Phrasikleia's name with her κλέος as an eternal κόρε; this epigram places great emphasis on the role of Phrasikleia (φράσαι / φράσασθαι + κλέος) as 'one who shows κλέος' or 'one who concentrates on κλέος,' thereby redefining κλέος, a fame traditionally based in acoustic transmission (cf. epic κλέος, καλέειν), as information communicated in visual format in the grave complex (φράσαι).[56] While 24.ii indicates the speech of the σῆμα, 24.i could either reflect the speech of the kore-statue mounted at the site, Phrasikleia as a continual kore in death, or a joint entity in which the speaking kore-statue is viewed as the embodiment of the dead Phrasikleia.[57] It remains unclear whether the kore depicted in sculpture and speech at the gravesite is identified with the deceased, or functions solely as a persona, analogous to the personified σῆμα.

In a similar vein, a few epigrams are in the second person and feature imperatives directed at the reader[58] from an unidentified speaker, whom the reader may understand as the mourner, the sculptor of the monument, or even the monument itself:

> [εἴτε ἀστό]ς τις ἀνὲρ εἴτε χσένος | ἄλοθεν ἐλθὸν :
> Τέτιχον οἰκτίρα | ς ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν παρίτο, :
> ἐν πολέμοι | φθίμενον, νεαρὰν hέβεν ὀλέσαν | τα. :
> ταῦτ' ἀποδυράμενοι νεῖσθε ἐπ | ὶ πρᾶγμ' ἀγαθὸν.
> (CEG 13, Attica, ca. 575-550?)
> Whether some citizen or a foreigner coming from elsewhere,
> pass by in pity of Tetichos, a good man,
> who died in war, destroying his fresh youth.
> Mourning this, go on to a good deed.

Rehm, *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton, 1994): 29-41.

[56] Svenbro 14-16.

[57] See Ecker 202 on CEG 24, where the 'I' of the epigram appears to reflect both the σῆμα and the deceased Phrasikleia.

[58] CEG 13, 27, 28, 51.

παιδὸς ἀποφθιμένοιο Κλεοίτο τô Μεν | εσαίχμο·
μνε̂μ' ἐσορο̂ν οἴκτιρ' ὸς καλὸς | ο̂ν ἔθανε.
(CEG 68, Attica, ca. 500?)
The memorial of Kleoitos, the deceased son of Menesaichmos:
seeing [it], feel pity that he died, being so beautiful.

The epigrams adopt a prescriptive and paradigmatic function, assigning value to the death (ὸς καλὸς | ο̂ν ἔθανε 68.2) and prescribing the reader's momentary reaction to the monument (οἴκτιρ', 68.2) and even his / her long-term activity based on the paradigm established by the text (νε̂σθε ἐπ | ὶ πρα̂γμ' ἀγαθὸν, 13.4).

We see this particular trend further extended by second person epigrams where a relative, mourner, or sculptor addresses the dead, and the readers reproduce this exchange through their reading of the epigram, which becomes a form of invoking and memorializing the dead:

[σ]ε̂μα τόδε, Χσενόφαντε, | πατέρ σο⟨ι⟩ θε̂κε θανόντι...
This σῆμα, Xenophas, your father erected for you at death
(CEG 50.1, Attica, ca. 510?)

['Α]λκίμαχ', εὔδοχσόν σε χ[υτὲ κ] | ατὰ γαι̂' ἐκάλυφσεν...
Alkimachos, heaped-up earth covers you, a person of good repute...
(CEG 69.1, Attica, ca. 500?).[59]

Like the orally performed γόοι, the archaic epigram often contains onomatopoetic terms of mourning (ὀ | λοφυρόμενος CEG 14.2, στονόϝεσαν ἀϝυτάν, CEG 145.3, [οἴ]μοι CEG 49), as well as alliteration or assonance reflecting the sounds of mourning.[60] Through onomatopoeia, direct-speech format, and allusion to the physical and psychological activity of funeral ritual, the epigram creates a fiction of solidarity between the reader, the mourners, and the deceased. The first- or second-person speech, be it of the σῆμα, the deceased, or the reader, initiates communication between the sender of the epigram and the reader; the persona speaking from or even to the σῆμα bridges the chronological divide between the immediate death ritual, the erection of the monument, and the repeated readings of the inscription.

---

[59] CEG 19, 50; cf. 69 and 163 though of later date. See also Ecker 49-50, and Svenbro passim on writing as aiming to inspire the reader to read aloud, reflecting a persistent oral aspect to writing in the culture of oralcy.

[60] e.g. *Il.* 24.741-5: ἄρρητον δὲ τοκεῦσι γόον καὶ πένθος ἔθηκας,
Ἕκτορ. ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα λελείψεται ἄλγεα λυγρά.
οὐδέ τί μοι εἶπες πύκινον ἔπος, οὗ τέ κεν αἰεί
μεμνῄμην νύκτας τε καὶ ἤματα δάκρυ χέουσα.

In accordance with its core function of connecting the name and identity of the deceased with the gravesite, the third person grave epigram usually consists of standard formulae, such as 'X lies here' or 'This is the σῆμα [μνῆμα] of X[61],' which can appear alone or embedded within a longer message:

Σεμιάδο τόδε σε̄μα (CEG 23, Attica, ca. 550-525?)
This is the σῆμα of Semias.

ἐς Σαμίοις γενναῖος ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ σήματι τῷδε |
    Λεάναξ Ἡραγόρεω κεῖται ἀποπρὸ φίλων.
(CEG 52i, Attica, ca. 510-500?)
A noble man among the Samians: beneath this σῆμα
lies Leanax son of Heragoreus, apart from his friends.

Προμάθο τόδε σᾶμα φιλοξένο ἀνδρός. (CEG 140, Aetolia, 7th c.?[62])
This is the σῆμα of Promathos, a hospitable man.

The epigram's communication is expanded by the inclusion of the person(s), often kin, who erect the monument in memory of the deceased; these σήματα are marked with the formula 'X erected this monument for Y[63],' or the like. This formula highlights the active function of each person involved with the burial site:

τόδ' Ἀρχίο 'στι σε̄μα: κἀ | δελφε̄ς φίλες,:
Εὐκοσ|μιδες : δὲ τοῦτ' ἐποί | εσεν καλόν,:
στέλε|ν : δ' ἐπ' αὐτο̂ι : θε̄κε Φ | αίδιμοσοφός.
(CEG 26, Attica, ca. 540-530?)
This is the σῆμα of Archios and his dear sister,
Eukosmides made it beautiful,
The skilled Phaidimos placed the stele upon it.

The hierarchy of significant participants in the shaping of the gravesite begins with the deceased who possesses the σῆμα, followed by Eukosmides (εὐ + κόσμος) who shapes the σῆμα's aesthetic effect, and finally Phaidimos, who erects the inscribed stele which bears the message being read.

[61] CEG 23, 26, 29, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 54, 60, 61, 62, 63, 70, 71, 140, 143, 145, 159, Friedländer 2.

[62] Especially interesting here is the alignment of the deceased's name with the details that characterize him (Σεμιάδο... σε̄μα, Προμάθο.. φιλοξένο).

[63] CEG 15, 16, 26, 32, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42, 45, 46, 53, 54, 57, 65, 66, 71, 109, 138, 139, 152, 164, 165, 169, P. Friedländer, and H. B. Hoffleit, *Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars* (Berkeley, 1948) 3a, 7; in many of these inscriptions, the act of creation and erection of the monument is emphasized by the use of ποιεῖν: CEG 26, 31, 52, 61, 66, 111, 157.

In the Homeric depictions of mourning, the passivity associated with lament is contrasted with the activity of constructing the grave mound or another durable marker of the burial site; the archaic epigrams likewise represent the construction of the gravesite and the erection of the stele as an active response to death: ἐποί | εσεν... θε̃κε (26.2-3). While the creative role of the lamenting kinswoman as performer is never explicitly treated in Homer, the artist and donor of the epigram take on new importance as active participants in the formation of the grave site (ἐργάζεσθαι, ποιεῖν).[64] The donor actively marks the burial site (ἐπι-, κατατιθέναι) with the epigram on the σῆμα, which aims to make an aesthetic impression (καλόν 18.2, 165.2) or to fulfill socially expected and acceptable response(s) to death, such as the generation and preservation of memory[65] or the fulfillment of reciprocities among the survivors or between the living and the dead:

> τόπικλέος παιδός Δαμα | σιστράτο ἐνθάδε σε̃μα |
> Πεισιάναχς κατέθεκε. τὸ | γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντο[ς].
> (CEG 40, Attica, ca. 530-520?)
> Here is the σῆμα of Damasistratos, son of Epikles.
> Peisianax set it up, for this is the fitting honor of the deceased.

> σε̃μα πατὲρ Κλέ[[β]] | βολος ἀποφθιμέ | νοι Χσενοφάντοι |
> θε̃κε τόδ' ἀντ' ἀρετε̃ς | ἐδὲ σαοφροσύνες.
> (CEG 41i, Attica, ca. 530-520?)
> Father Klebbolos set up this σῆμα for the dead Xenophas
> in exchange for his excellence and moderation.

> (i) παιδὸς Νέλονος Νε | λονίδο ἐστὶ τὸ σε̃μ | α
> ὃς χὐδι {το} ἀ[γα]θο̃ι | {ι} μνε̃μα ἐποίει (sic) χα | ρίεν.
> (ii) Ἔνδοιος κ[α]ὶ τόνδ' ἐποίε.
> (CEG 42, Attica, ca. 525?)
> (i) This is the σῆμα of Nelonides, son of Nelon,
> who made a gratifying memorial for his noble son.
> (ii) And Endoios made it.

The preceding epigrams highlight the activity of setting up and marking the gravesite: κατέθεκε (40.2), θε̃κε (41i.2), ἐποίει (42i.2), ἐποίε (42ii). The

[64] ἐργάζεσθαι of the artist (18.2) and of the donor (138.1, cf. the building of the tomb as an ἔργον 165.2), ποιεῖν of the artist (26.2, 31.3, 42ii, 50.3, 52ii, 66.3, 139.1?) and the donor (42i.2, 61.2, 139.1?, 143.2, 157). The artist's activity is also highlighted by the speech of the σῆμα which asserts, 'X made me' (24ii, 34ii, 36i, 70.2).

[65] i.e. the monument as μνῆμα 32.2, 42i.2, 54.2, 137.2.

epigrams assimilate the roles of the donor (ἐποίει 42i.2) and the sculptor (ἐποίε 42ii) and equate their activity with either death ritual (γέρας... θανόντο[ς] 40.2) or an exchange between individuals, in which the concrete activity of setting up the tombsite is exchanged for the abstract virtues of the deceased (ἀντ' ἀρετε̃ς | ἐδὲ σαοφροσύνες 41i.2[66]). Thus, the gravesite forms a locus of reciprocity between the living and the dead, an idea which is encapsulated in the frequent appearance of χάρις or χαρίζεσθαι to describe the function of the σῆμα.[67]

In poetic contexts, χάρις is a 'beautiful and pleasurable compensation, through song or poetry, for a deed deserving of glory'[68]; yet beyond immediate poetic and economic categories, χάρις designates a wide range of objects whose pleasurable beauty makes them homologous.[69] Accordingly, here the poetic and visual impression of the σῆμα function as an object of exchange between the mourners and the deceased which creates analogous types of χάρις, of verbal, visual, and social pleasure. In the funeral monument, this reciprocity can also extend beyond individuals to include the larger social or political group of whom the deceased was a member. This Corcyran epigram was inscribed in a single line on a round grave mound formed of stones and probably topped by a sculpture of a lion:

> ◊ hυιοῦ Τλασίαϝο Μενεκράτεος τόδε σᾶμα·
> Οἰανθέος γενεάν, τόδε δ' αὐτο̃ι δᾶμος ἐποίει.·
> ἐς γὰρ πρόξενϝος δάμου φίλος. ἀλλ' ἐνὶ πόντοι·
> ὄλετο, δαμόσιον δὲ κα϶ὸν ρο[(») - »» –].:
> Πραχιμένες δ' αὐτο̃ι γ[αία]ς ἄπο πατρίδος ἐνθὸν·
> σὺν δάμ[ο]ι τόδε σᾶμα κασιγνέτοιο πονέθε.:
> (CEG 143, Corcyra, ca. 625-600 BCE?, dating uncertain)
> This is the σῆμα of Menekrates, son of Tlasias.
> Though he came from Oianthe, the δῆμος made this for him,
> for he was a proxenos, a friend of the δῆμος. But at sea
> he perished, and a public misfortune...
> Coming from his fatherland, Praximenes
> labored over his brother's σῆμα together with the δῆμος.

---

[66] Cf. 139 (Troezen, ca. 500?):
Πραξιτέλει τόδε μνᾶμα ϝίσον ποίϝεσε θανό[ντι]
[τ]οῦτο δ' ἑταῖροι | σᾶμα χέαν βαρέα στενάχοντες
ϝέργον ἀντ' ἀγ[α]θο̃ν κἐπάμερον | ἐξετέλεσα[ν].

[67] CEG 42i.2 χαρίεν, 57.2 χαριζόμενοι, 58.6 χαριζόμενος, 165.2 κεχαριζομένον ἔργον, 169.2 χαριζόμενη.

[68] Gregory Nagy, *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore, 1990): 65, cf. *Od.* 9.5, Pind. *Ol.* 1.28-32, *Pyth.* 11.50-8, *Isthm.* 7.16ff..

[69] MacLachlan 10-11.

In this case, both kin relationship (κασιγνέτοιο, 6) and social belonging (πρόξενϝος, 3) determine the reciprocity embodied by the tombstone; the special status of the deceased as δάμου φίλος (3) makes his death likewise a δαμόσιον... καϙόν (4). When Homeric lament thematizes the interrelationship of the individual death with the collective fate (e.g. Hector and Troy), this interrelationship is communicated by the individual kin performing the γόος, who mourns her future fate and the analogical destiny of her city. This epigram demonstrates a similar analogy between kin and polis, yet obscures the mourning and the aftermath of the death. It instead emphasizes the parallel significance of the deceased in kinship and political groupings and the mutual activities of kin and δῆμος in shaping the burial site; this paralleling of active private and public reciprocities anticipates the increased predominance of the public monument for the dead.

The emphasis on the activity of those constructing the gravesite is rooted both in the position of the gravemarker as a record of completed death ritual and as a diachronic alternative to the reactive and synchronic lament. The activity of marking the tombsite not only assures the memorialization of the deceased, the donor and the artist, but also adds a new aspect of aesthetic function to the creation of the gravesite. While the Homeric γόος states no explicit aesthetic aims, the inscribed gravemarker strives to be καλός and to preserve the 'beautiful death' with its own visual and verbal aesthetics; the creator of the stele takes on a title that alludes both to skill in craftsmanship and to the function of the poet and his audience – σοφός, used of skilled craftsmen and of 'those who are "skilled" in understanding poetry... who understand the *message* of the *code* that is poetry.'[70] The group determining the shape of the tombsite begins to expand beyond the immediate kinship group as the larger social group (ἑταῖροι, δῆμος) and the workers who fashion the gravesite join in the process of memorialization and are themselves memorialized. Accordingly, the language used to characterize the fashioning of the gravesite comes to match the newly accessible significance of the funerary activity: reciprocity (ἀντί, χάρις), poetic craft (σοφός), and social or political affiliation (πρόξενϝος, δῆμος). In the Homeric γόος, the lament marks the end of the warrior's life cycle and thus of his exchange with the larger group; the lament is

[70] Gregory Nagy, 'Ancient Greek Epic and Praise Poetry: Some Typological Considerations,' *Oral Tradition in Literature: Interpretation in Context* ed. J. M. Foley (Columbia, Missouri, 1986): 89-102, cf. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans* 240 and Ecker 147-9 for comparanda on the idea of the artist as σοφός.

limited to the kinswoman, whose performance is singular and represents no larger generic tradition within which each performer asserts her poetic craft. Diachrony endows the gravesite and its messages with continued accessibility that allows the epigram to claim long-term reciprocity or social communication occurring at the gravesite. The changes among the participants and the emphases in the communication of the epigram reflect its position as a public medium that encompasses a wider, non-kin group. Thus, the grave epigram addresses less the personal experience treated by lament than it records the facts of completed death and mourning; it expresses collective priorities such as aesthetics, social belonging and values, as well as the nature of its own communication.

Above, I have discussed the mechanisms of the epigram as a written supplement to and artifact of lament and funerary ritual. As such, the texts of the epigram remain bound to oral rhetoric (e.g. the first- and second-person epigrams) and to the referential tradition (e.g. Homeric formulae). Within the culture of oralcy, the rational understanding of the epigram's written text depends on the oral rhetorical code familiar to the audience of readers; the epigram represents a text that incorporates this oral rhetoric into a written context, which itself introduces new aspects to the composition process, such as possible revisions and various audiences of individual readers.[71] The epigrams share various characteristic formulae, some drawn from referential traditions of epic and other poetic genres, and others limited to the gravemarkers themselves. The latter formulae center mainly on the monument and its donor: the essential connection of monument and the name of the deceased[72] and the type (σῆμα, μνῆμα, στάλα), builder[73], donor[74], location[75], and purpose of the monument.[76] Formulae specific to the grave epigram rarely address the nature

---

[71] Cf. Alain Renoir, 'Oral-Formulaic Rhetoric and the Interpretation of Written Texts,' in J. M. Foley, ed., *Oral Tradition in Literature: Interpretation in Context* (Columbia, Missouri, 1986): 103-135, especially 116-9.

[72] The following formulae express this connection: σῆμα + genitive name (24, 27, 49) or kinship designation (46); σῆμα τόδ' [ἐστι / εἰμί] + genitive name (29, 72, 145) or genitive name + [ἐστι] τόδε σῆμα (16, 23, 35, 37, 38, 42, 71, 140, 143, cf. 26); στάλα + genitive name (146, 164); μνῆμα with genitive name (159) or καταφθίμενος in the genitive (54, 58).

[73] nominative name + μ' ἐποίησε (24ii, 34, 36, 41) or nominative name + ἐποίησε (50, 52ii, 66, cf. 70).

[74] nominative name / kinship designation + ἔθεκε (46, 55); nominative name + [ἐπ]έθεκε θανόντι (15, 25, 32, 71, 111, 113, 169, cf. 138 ἐπέθεκε παιδί); nominative name + κατέθεκε (35, 40).

[75] ἐνθάδε σῆμα (40. 53, 137), σῆμα τόδ' ἐνγύς + ὁδός in genitive (16, 39, 74), ἐπὶ τύμοι (144, 146).

[76] dative + χαριζόμενος / -η / -οι (57, 58, 169).

of the deceased[77], his or her death, the grief of the survivors, and the communication of the monument with the reader.[78] This suggests that epigrams might be composed around basic information regarding the deceased, the monument, and its donor or manufacturer, with individual details added as required.

In addition, the grave epigram appropriates traditional expression from other poetic genres in the following contexts[79]:

1) formulae designating the circumstances of death or mourning:

a) circumstances of death: ἐν πολέμοι (CEG 13.3, 136.3)[80], ἀντὶ γάμο (24.2)[81], ἐν προμάχοις (27)[82], θο̄ρος Ἄρες (27)[83], πόλεμόν θ' ἅμα δα | κρυόεντα

[77] The expression ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός appears mainly as a genitive modifying σῆμα (16, 34, 36, 74: note in particular the formula σε̄μα ἀγαθο̄ καὶ σόφρονος ἀνδρός in the 16, 34, and 36), and also in the accusative as the object of verbs of mourning (οἰκτίρα|ς 13, θάψα 136). With the exception of 136, which originates from Argos, all epigrams containing this expression are Attic, suggesting a regional expression (cf. the pairing of ἀρετή and σωφροσύνη, also limited to Attic epigrams 41 and 58).

[78] A few third-person epigrams thematize the occurrence of the death itself (67) or its context, especially when the deceased died in wartime (e.g. 47, 145); others record the grief of the deceased's friends (59, 158) or the grief of the reader: στε̄θι καὶ οἴκτιρον 27.1 and 28.2).

[79] For a compilation of hexametric formulae in the funerary epigram down to the fifth century BCE, see Zopito Di Tillio, 'Confronti formulari e lessicali tra le iscrizioni esametriche ed elegiache dal VII al V sec. a. C. e l'epos arcaico: I. Iscrizioni sepolcrali,' *QUCC* 7 (1969): 45-73. Di Tillio's listing is in some cases more detailed than my own, as he has a broader definition of 'formula,' often extending to single words in corresponding positions in the hexameter or possible variations on formulae.

[80] ἐν πολέμῳ is used in expressions characterizing war and counsel as the activities of warriors: *Il.* 2.202 (Odysseus bringing the Achaeans back to the assembly), 12.214 (Polydamas to Hector on not challenging Hector's supremacy in war and counsel), 18.106 (Achilles as unsurpassed in war, but not best in counsel). This phrase also refers to war as the activity of a larger social group, thus underscoring the strong interrelationship between individual and group in the martial undertaking: *Il.* 5.861 (Achaeans and Trojans at war), 8.234 (Agamemnon on the Achaeans' past boasts about fighting the Trojans), 12.271 (Aiantes: all are not equal in war), 14.149 (mass battle cry), 15.698 (Achaeans and Trojans at war), 16.591 (cast of a war javelin as a simile for the Trojan retreat), 21.610 (Trojan dead in the war). Similarly, in Tyrtaeus (11.8, 12.10-20), ἐν πολέμῳ designates situations in which the values of the individual are tested within the group effort of war.

[81] *Od.* 20.307 καί κέ τοι ἀντὶ γάμοιο πατὴρ τάφον ἀμφεπονεῖτο (Telemachus threatens Ktesippus with burial rather than a wedding), *H. Aphr.* 29 τῇ δὲ πατὴρ Ζεὺς δῶκε καλὸν γέρας ἀντὶ γάμοιο (Hestia).

[82] In the Homeric poems, ἐν προμάχοισι is used of single combat in the front lines (*Il.* 3.31 [Paris sees Menelaus at the front line], 15.342 [Paris fleeing from the front]) and in general of a single warrior standing at the front lines of an army (*Il.* 11.188, 203 [Agamemnon]), again situating the individual within the framework of the larger group. The elegies of Tyrtaeus characterize the death in the front lines as καλόν (10.1, 30 W) or ἐσθλόν (12.16 W) for the group to which the warrior belonged; the self-sacrifice of the individual brings κλέος to his social group: αὐτος δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσὼν φίλον λεσε θυμόν, / ἄστύ τε καὶ λαοὺς καὶ πατέρ' εὐκλείσας (12.23-4 W).

[83] *Il.* 5.30, 35, 355, 454, 507, 830, 904, 15.127, 142, 21.406, 24.498, cf. Tyrt. 12.34.

(47.2)[84], οὐ γὰρ παῖδες ἐνὶ μεγάροις ἐγένοντο (138.2)[85], ἐνὶ πόντῳ (143.3)[86], γαίας ἀπὸ πατρίδος (143.5)[87], τὸνδ' ὄλεσεν Ἄρες (145.1)[88], παρὰ ναυσίν (145.2)[89], ἐπ' Ἀράθθοιο rhoϝαῖσι (145.2)[90], στονόϝεσσαν ἀϝυτάν (145.3).[91] Many of these formulae are associated with danger (the sea), liminality (lack of marriage, distance from homeland, location near the ships), or collective action (war, assembly) and thus emphasize the particular marcation of the extraordinary or the collectively relevant death with traditional formulae.

b) circumstances of mourning: παῖδ' ὀ|λοφυρόμενος (14.2)[92], βαρέα στενάχοντες (139.2).[93]

2) formulae indicating the position of the individual in relation to his or her kinship and social groups: hυιοῦ Τλασίαϝο (CEG 143.1)[94], Οἰανθέος γενεάν (143.2)[95]; ἐν πολέμοι (13, 136) and other formulae describing the martial activity of the deceased could be included here, as they situate the individual warrior within the group effort of war.

3) formulae describing the nature or function of the monument: ἐνγὺς ho|δοῖ (16.2, 39.1)[96], πατρὶ χ[α]|ριζόμενοι (57.2)[97], ἐπὶ τύμβωι (144.1, 146).[98] Formulaic diction also extends to the designation of the monu-

---

[84] *Il.* 17.512 πόλεμον κατὰ δακρυόεντα (Hector and Aeneas fighting) and others.

[85] Cf. *Il.* 5.270 τῶν οἱ ἓξ ἐγένοντο ἐνὶ μεγάροισι γενέθλη (horses of Tros), *Od.* 10.5 τοῦ καὶ δώδεκα παῖδες ἐνὶ μεγάροις γεγάασι (Aeolus) and others.

[86] e.g. Hom. *Od.* 4.354 (Proteus' island), 821 (Penelope worried about the dangers to Telemachus in his travels), 10.51 (Odysseus considers throwing himself overboard after his loss of Aeolus' winds), 13.168 (end of the Phaeacian ship), 16.367 (Penelope's suitors sail to ambush Telemachus), 19.277 (death of Odysseus' crew at sea), 23.234 (shipwreck). The traditional usages of this phrase mark presence in the sea as a marginal place fraught with danger or extremity; this corresponds to the epigrams' usage of the phrase to designate the extraordinary nature of the death at sea.

[87] *Od.* 10.49 (release of Aeolus' winds).

[88] Cf. of Priam's sons: τοὺς μὲν ἀπώλεσ' Ἄρης (*Il.* 24.260).

[89] e.g. Hom. *Il.* 1.26, 89 (Chryses), 305 (Achaean assembly), 344 (Achaeans fighting), 415 (Achilles grieving), 2.392 (Agamemnon's threat to warriors lingering by the ships), 7.72 (Achaean alternatives of taking Troy or suffering defeat beside their ships), 8.183 (Achaean ships on fire), and numerous others. The location near the ships is neutral at best, but often liminal in its association with the border of Achaean activity, including mourning figures such as Chryses and Achilles.

[90] Cf. *Il.* 16.669 ποταμοῖο ῥοῇσι (washing of Sarpedon's corpse).

[91] Cf. *Od.* 11.383 στονόεσσαν αὐτήν (Trojan war).

[92] Cf. *Od.* 19.522 παῖδ' ὀλοφυρομένη Ἴτυλον φίλον (nightingale)

[93] *Il.* 13.423 νῆας ἔπι γλαφυρὰς φερέτην βαρέα στενάχοντα (wounded warrior) and others; see above on στενάχειν.

[94] Cf. *Od.* 3.489 υἱέος Ὀρτιλόχοιο, etc.

[95] Cf. *Il.* 23.471 Αἰτωλὸς γενεήν.

[96] *Od.* 13.268 (ambush)

[97] *Od.* 13.265 οὕνεκ' ἄρ' οὐχ ᾧ πατρὶ χαριζόμενος θεράπευον (Odysseus' mendacious story told to Athena).

[98] *Il.* 11.371, 17.434 , *Od.* 11.77 (stele or other marker on grave).

ment's reading audience (χσένος | ἄλοθεν ἐλθόν, 13.1)[99] and the nature of the reader's mourning, connecting the sight of the monument with the reaction of pity: οἴκτιρον : σε͂μα Θράσονος : ἰδόν (28.2).[100]
4) formulae referring to the fate of death itself or to the aftermath for the survivors: πένθος | θε͂κας (50.2)[101], πέν | θ]ος ἄλαστον (59.2)[102], and the general connection of θάνατος and πότμος as themes (θα | [νάτοιο] πότμος, 39.2, cf. μοῖρα... θα[νάτο], 158.2).[103] Probably belonging to a similar grouping is φρασὶν : ἄλα μενοινο͂ν (28.1)[104], a formula that contrasts the inner preoccupations of the passer-by with the outward adhortation of the funerary epigram to mourn and so to display outward grief; the epigram implies the mournful significance of its own text by contrasting it with the preoccupations and the activity of the living reader.
While it explains the function of the gravesite (3), traditional expression also appeals to the audience's commonalities of poetic expression and understanding, emphasizes the interrelationship of individual and group (2, 4), and marks the death as relevant to the audience both as a common human experience and as communication worthy of further transmission. In general, where the epigrams draw upon traditional formulaic expression regarding the deceased, formulaic expression is concentrated in the epigrams of those dying exceptional deaths – the death at sea, away from the homeland or in war (1). The particularly high concentration of formulae marking the warrior's burial most likely stems from its supranormal and yet collectively relevant status. The formulae in warriors' epigrams focus on the deceased's former martial activity, his death in war, and his

---

[99] Cf. *Od.* 17.382 τίς γὰρ δὴ ξεῖνον καλεῖ ἄλλοθεν αὐτὸς ἐπελθὼν (Telemachus to Antinous on ξένοι), 20.360 ἀφραίνει ξεῖνος νέον ἄλλοθεν εἰληλουθώς (Eurymachus on Theoclymenus' warning to the suitors).

[100] Cf. *Il.* 23.534 τὸν δὲ ἰδὼν ᾤκτειρε ποδαρκὴς δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς (Achilles pities the loser in a race).

[101] This phrase attributes responsibility for grief and the resulting lament either to an enemy warrior or to the deceased himself: ἄρρητον δὲ τοκεῦσι γόον καὶ πένθος ἔθηκας (*Il.* 17.37 (Menelaus' killing of Euphorbus' brother), 24.741 (Andromache on Hector's death). While the traditional usage of the phrase is associated with the γόος, the diachronically accessible epigram, as a representation of the completed death ritual, eliminates the explicit mention of the γόος and leaves it implicit for the reader.

[102] This phrase often marks the loss of children: Hes. *Th.* 467 (Rhea's grief at Kronos' swallowing her children), Hom. *Il.* 24.105 (Thetis' grief), *Od.* 24.423 (Eupeithes' grief at death of his son Antinous).

[103] *Il.* 2.359 (of warriors wanting to desert the war effort), 15.495 (a warrior's death), 20.337 (Achilles' death), *Od.* 24.31 (death in Troy).

[104] Cf. *Il.* 14.221 ἀπρηκτόν γε νέεσθαι, ὅ τι φρεσὶ σῇσιν μενοινᾷς (Aphrodite and Hera), *Od.* 2.92 ἀγγελλίας προϊεῖσα. νόος δὲ οἱ ἄλλα μενοινᾷ, 13.381, 18.283 (Penelope and the suitors).

loss of youth[105]; yet the difference of the warrior's burial from other gravesites is signaled in standard fashion, lending a collective relevance to the individual dead, each of whom is marked by similar formulaic diction.

While the oral rhetoric and formulaic aspect of the epigrams are to be differentiated from the performance of the Homeric bard or the archaic poet, the epigram is an often metrical genre and a medium interacting with various other media at the gravesite (lament, ritual, visual art)[106], and thus hardly autonomous from the thematic concerns of other poetic and artistic genres. The epigram draws from the common poetic traditions of epic, lyric, elegy, and encomia, which represent a referentiality accessible to a possible reader or to an audience of someone reading a grave epigram. When the epigram calls attention to the visual aesthetics of the monument (καλὸν ἰδε̃ν, CEG 18.2)[107], it is with the transience of the moment of death and of the burial rite in mind; the permanent beauty of the σῆμα stands in both for the deceased and for the skill of the artist on which the deceased's memory depends. This is not only a connection of visual aesthetics and verbal signification in the σῆμα but also an appropriation of the 'beautiful death' theme from epic and elegy.[108] In general, the Homeric epics bear a strong thematic influence on the grave epigram, including the personification of death or the god who causes death, the image of simultaneous ritual activity and weeping, and the concept of γέρας θανόντων.[109] The Homeric phraseology used in the epigrams centers on the heroic death in battle and the heroic burial – the processes

---

[105] Former martial activity (ὅς/ὅν ποτε 27.2, 112.2; ἐν[ὶ] προμάχοις 27.2, 112.2); death in war and loss of youth (ἐν πολέμοι φθίμενον | νεαρὰν hέβεν ὀλέσαν|τα, 13.3, 136.3), cf. also attribution of death to Ares (ὄλεσε | θο̃ρος Ἄρες 27.2, ὄλεσεν Ἄρες 145.1).

[106] See Enniger and Schwens 140 and 174-5 on the cemetery as a cultural text with various media signaling similar ideas – within a larger context of spatial signals (e.g. spatial relationships within the cemetery, as well as the difference between the interior and the exterior of cemeteries), various multicodal texts operate with different semiotic systems (language, visual arts, architecture, proxemics) expressed in multiple media (wood, metal, stone, and ceramics).

[107] cf. CEG 26.2 (Εὐκο*υ* |σμίδες: του̃τ' ἐποί|εσεν καλόν [Attica, ca. 540-530?]), 161 (ἦ καλὸν τὸ μνῆμα [πα]|τὴρ ἔστησε θανόσ[ηι]|Λεαρέτηι· οὐ γὰρ [ἔτ]|ι ζω̃σαν ἐσοφσόμ[εθα]. [Thasos, ca. 500-490?]), 165.2 (τὸ δὲ σα̃μ' Εὔνο|ς ἔστασε καλὸν κεχαρισμένον ἔργον [Sicinus, 7th c.?]). On the visual aesthetics of the monument, see Ecker 140-1, Sourvinou-Inwood 143.

[108] cf. Day 18 on this theme in CEG 13.3: ἐν πολέμοι φθίμενον | νεαρὰν hέβεν ὀλέσαν|τα.

[109] personification of death or the god who causes death: θάνατος CEG 46.2, Hades (CEG 75.1), πόντος CEG 132, Ares CEG 145.1; cf. Ecker 57ff., 153; simultaneous ritual activity and weeping: CEG 139.2, cf. Ecker 124f.; γέρας θανόντων: CEG 40.2, cf. Ecker 219.

that guarantee the passage of the individual into the cultural memory. The monument offers the γέρας θανόντο[ς] (40.2), κλέος (24i.1) or an analogy to the 'beautiful death' (13.3), attributing importance to the gravesite which is rooted in the oral referential system. These motifs support the function of the epigram in the transmission of memory by juxtaposing the verbal and visual communication of the individual burial with the heroic death and death ritual of the referential tradition. These references from the oral tradition mark the inscribed epigram as a text with significance for cultural memory; where the epigram displays attributes of epic, it echoes received cultural memory and seeks further transmission itself.

As Ecker has argued, the thematic affinities of grave epigram lie not only in epic but also in lyric and elegy.[110] Some motifs are common to epic, lyric, elegy and epigram, such as the warrior ethic[111] or the idea that the deceased leaves grief to the survivors.[112] The well-developed elegiac tradition serves as a source for the motifs of the ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός and the adhortation to ἀρετή[113]; this focus on behavioral norms in the σῆμα also suggests a connection of epigram with encomiastic or gnomic poetry.[114] As noted by Labarbe[115], the epigram shares various themes with gnomic poetry and thus with praise poetry, which draws on gnomic material:
1) The personification of Hades (75.1) and θάνατος (46.2)[116] as well as the inevitability of death:

> ['Α]ντιλόχο : ποτὶ σε̂μ' ἀγαθο̂ | καὶ σόφρονος ἀνδρὸς |
> [δάκρυ κ]άταρ[χ]σον, ἐπεὶ καὶ | σὲ μένει θάνατος.
> (CEG 34, Attica, ca. 530?)
> At the σῆμα of Antilochos, a good and moderate man,
> shed a tear, since death awaits you also.

---

[110] 87-88 and 88n.197.

[111] For the warrior ethic in epic, lyric, and elegy, see Ecker 82-7.

[112] CEG 50.1-2 ([σ]ε̂μα τόδε, Χσενόφαντε, | πατέρ σο⟨ι⟩ θε̂κε θανόντι | / Σόφιλος hοι πένθος | θε̂κας ἀποφθίμενος. | [Attica, ca. 510?]) and 113 (μνᾶμ' ἐπ' 'Ολιγέ|δαι{ι} μ' ὁ πατὲρ ἐ|πέθεκε θανόν|τι / 'Οσθίλος, ο⟨ἷ⟩ πένθος θε̂κεν | ἀποφθίμενος. [Boeotia, ca. 500?]); cf. *Il.* 24.741-2 (Andromache's γόος), Sol. 21 (on his death); Fr. Mawet, 'Epigrammes, threnes et dithyrambes: les lamentations funebres de l'épopée,' *Le monde grec: hommages à Claire Preaux*, ed. J. Bingen, G. Cambier, and G. Nachtergael (Brussels, 1975): 36-7.

[113] Lausberg 105.

[114] Day (16-9) and others have also argued for the essential role of praise (Ferrari 264) and gnomic expression (Harvey 168-9) in the lament. Bruno Gentili, 'Epigramma ed Elegia,' *Entretiens Hardt* 14 (1967): 39-90, esp. 55, likewise notes the parainetic strategy in the epigrams' exhortations to the reader to lament.

[115] Jules Labarbe ('Les aspects gnomiques de l'épigramme grecque,' *Entretiens Hardt* 14 (1967): 351-386, esp. 362-8: Labarbe notes the various gnomic motifs below: the selected passages cited and the comparanda are my own.

[116] On the inevitability of death, see for example Callinus 1.8-13, Solon 24.7-10.

2) The concern about the youth of the deceased, especially the youth of warriors or of children dying before their parents, and the resulting concern about continuity between generations[117]:

> οἴκτιρο⟨ν⟩ προσορõ[ν] | παιδὸς τόδε σε̃μα | θανόντος:
> Σμικύθ[ο] | hóς τε φίλον ὄλεσε | ν ἔλπ' (sic) ἀγαθέν.
> (CEG 51, Attica, ca. 510?)
> Take pity as you view this, the σῆμα of [our] dead child
> Smikythos, who destroyed [our] good hopes.

3) The value placed on various ethical concepts and on specific types of conduct, especially martial activity (13, 19). The epigrams often assign the ethical qualities ubiquitous in other poetic and social contexts (ἀγαθός, φιλόξενος, σόφρων)[118] to the deceased at the gravesite as well:

> [σό]φρον, εὐ[χσύ | ν]ετος, χσε[νικ | ό]ς, πι[νυ]τός, τὰ | κάλ' [εἰδὸ]ς
> hop | [αίο θανάτ]ο μο | [ῖραν hέχε]ι Ξσ | [...6...] (CEG 67 [Attica, ca. 500?])
> Temperate, intelligent, hospitable, wise, knowledgeable of beautiful things:
> X[...] attained the fate of a timely death.

While epic draws its behavioral paradigms from the actions of living heroes without reference to their later death (Achilles / Meleager, Telemachus / Orestes), lament as depicted in epic is a genre whose association with death and whose singular performances prevent its assumption of a parainetic function. By contrast, the diachrony of the inscribed monument allows the deceased's prior activity and identity to be preserved and enables the epigram to function as a written record with a paradigmatic function much like that of gnomic and praise poetry.

The epigram not only draws consequences for the reader from the gravesite in gnomic form, but also has a further analogizing function, portraying the death of the warrior in Homeric diction and so linking the hero of the past with the contemporary deceased, a strategy which forms the core of exchange between laudator and laudandus in Pindaric poetry,

---

[117] On the youth of warriors, see 13.3, 136.3; on children dying before their parents, see for example 25, 32, 35, 46, 137, 138. On the youth of the deceased as ideal and the problem of parents losing their children, cf. also Tyrt. 10.15-32 and Mimnermus 2.13-4, respectively.

[118] e.g. ἀγαθός (CEG 13.2, 14.2, 16.2, 34.1, 36ii, 42i.2, 44.2, 74.2, 136.2), χσε[νικ | ός] (CEG 67.2, cf. χσενίαν 111.2), φιλόξενος (CEG 140), σόφρων (CEG 30b.2, 34.1, 41i.2, 58.4, 67.1, 69.2, 136.4), ἀρετή (CEG 20.1, 41i.2, 58.4, 69.2), ἀνορέα (CEG 31.2), γενναῖος (CEG 52.1), πινυτός (CEG 67.1, 69.2), hιποσύναν (CEG 111.2), ἀε⟨θ⟩λοφόρος (CEG 136.4); see Sourvinou-Inwood 170-3 on the aristocratic aspect of these values.

where the athlete is paralleled with the mythical hero.[119] Praise poetry focuses on outstanding individuals who walk a fine line between alienating their communities and serving as their behavioral exempla; a praise poet like Pindar must negotiate between these two poles by developing poetic strategies of reintegrating the victor as an outstanding member within his community.[120] By contrast, the epigrams praise the deceased no longer as a member of the community, but as a figure integrated among the stable dead. The deceased are treated as a social *types*, such as the ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός (e.g. CEG 13.2), rather than as exceptional individuals; the inscription represents them as paradigmatic in behavior (οἰκτίρα | ς ἄνδρ' ἀγαθόν... νε͂σθε ἐπ | ὶ πρᾶγμ' ἀγαθὸν., CEG 13.2-4), and the grave as paradigmatic of human fate (ἐπεὶ καὶ | σὲ μένει θάνατος, CEG 34.2). It is for this reason that the epigrams' praise of the deceased can best be explained as parainetic, encouraging imitation of exemplary behavior; where it overlaps with other genres, the epigram focuses on motifs of exemplary collective action – war, political engagement, and reciprocity. Both Homeric and lyric motifs mark the contents of the epigram as acceptable for cultural memorability, while the language of praise links past and present accomplishment by connecting the dead with traditional heroic paradigms and by mediating the significance of the death to its audience as a paradigm for its behavior.

The advance of writing does not change the perception of the deceased, death, or grief per se; as with the transition from orality to literacy in general, the introduction of writing does not necessitate a change in eschatological, religious, or other beliefs. Rather, it changes the modes of communication about death and representation of the dead from the moment of their death, through death ritual to the transmission of their

---

[119] Nagy 'Ancient Greek Epic and Praise Poetry' 92-98. Nagy argues that funeral legislation requires reduction in oral praise of the individual, a phenomenon reflected in the contemporary increase in the written praise in the epigram (94-5). Funerary legislation controls oral expression at the gravesite (i.e. types of lament and participants in mourning), as well as the physical shape of the gravesite (type and size of mound, tomb structures); yet the legislative control of lament does not necessitate a replacement of the lament by the epigram on a one-to-one basis. It seems unlikely from our evidence that the content of the archaic lament was primarily encomiastic; though the Homeric γόοι adopt aspects of praise poetry (see Richardson 350-1), neither they nor the later Pindaric threnoi appear to serve a primarily encomiastic function. If anything, it is safest to suppose that the epigram with its new longevity and individual non-kin readership shares some aspects of the communication at the burial but most of all supplements the function of the synchronic lament diachronically.

[120] Kevin Crotty, *Song and Action: The Victory Odes of Pindar* (Baltimore, 1982) 112-122; Kurke 6.

individual identity into cultural memory. The inscribed gravemarker functions as a supplement to lament, recording the names of the dead, the mourners, and the artist of the monument[121], the social status of the deceased (personal characteristics, kinship, social, political, and ethnic affiliations) and the activity at the moment of death (e.g. martial activity) and at the funeral ritual (mourning, erection of the stele). In supplementing the lament and death ritual, the epigram represents a diachronically accessible and public genre which preserves the product of ritual passage, namely the reintegration of the dead and the survivors into their current social roles. In particular, the inscribed epigram employs these additional diachronic possibilities to mark the extraordinary death of the young or the warrior with script and traditional language. Through its chronological stability, the epigram documents the social roles and interchange between the dead and the mourners and expands the significance of the gravesite as paradigm; this documentary and paradigmatic function allows it to override the inherent limitations of mourning in the oral culture, as well as the liminality and passivity of lament and the potential ambiguity of the uninscribed σῆμα portrayed in the Homeric poems.

Regardless of differences in voice, all epigrams presuppose a donor or sculptor who wishes to transmit information to the reader. The third-person epigrams record information about the social connections between the dead and the living, their reciprocity in the funeral ritual, and the fact of the death itself; they may also communicate the aesthetic goals of the monument, which aims to be viewed by the reader as καλόν (18.2) or χαριέν (42i.2). In the few cases where the epigram features second person communication between the mourner and the deceased, this again represents a record of mourning (50.2, 163) or of the erection of the stone, but with potential for the reader to adopt the role of mourner by reading the epigram aloud. This documentary function of the third and second person can be extended by the simulation of an oral communication at the gravesite, where the personified σῆμα, the dead, or an unidentified 'I' addresses the reader. These 'talking stones' in the first and second person can further prescribe the appropriate reaction of the reader (28.2, 159.2), or ascribe a paradigmatic function to the deceased in gnomic fashion (13.4, 34i.2).

---

[121] H. Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala: Der bildende Künstler und sein Werk im vorplatonischen Schrifttum* (Berlin, 1968) 20 sees the multiplicity of names as central in the construction of the grave and as a result of a new desire to name names and to categorize with script; the artist's marcation of his work with his name implies both a new individual awareness and a general social acceptance of the visibility of the artist's identity (77).

With the onset of literacy, the Homeric configuration lament-σῆμα-epic is dissolved as lament is joined by an inscribed σῆμα which avoids ambiguity by preserving the link between the gravesite and the identity of the deceased (i.e. a μνῆμα) and thus offering the possibility of interpreting the gravesite as paradigm and of generating κλέος[122] for the deceased and those involved with the burial. While the Homeric lament forms the centerpiece of the ritual passage from life to death and the resulting changes within the social group, the epigram is no longer connected with the death ritual: the phases of separation and liminality are obscured as the permanent role of the deceased is preserved in the epigram. The σῆμα functions as the relic of the completed death ritual and confirms the status of the deceased as stable dead; the inscription 'This is the σῆμα of X' records not only the location of the dead, but also the fact of the individual's death and the connection of any visual representations at the tombsite with the deceased.[123] While in lament, the mourner communicates with the dead in the second person in a singly appropriate moment, the epigram involves continual communication between mourner and the non-kin reader diachronically; the gravemarker records the reciprocity between living and dead, and maintains long-term memory at the gravesite through the activity of the reader. While the lament is often construed as ineffectual in Homeric and archaic traditions, the epigram emphasizes the activity surrounding the creation of the monument that allows the continued communication of the epigram – the inscription and erection of the monument, the reciprocity between the dead and the mourners, and the continued communicative effectiveness of the σῆμα.

Where the archaic epigram departs from the traditional patterns we have seen in the Homeric laments above, the changes in the portrayal of mourning, mourners, and the deceased are rooted in the new written format of the epigram; these divergences stem from the two definitive aspects of its written format within the context of the gravesite: its limited spatial aspect and its diachronic durability. The spatial limitations of the epigram bind the significance of the text to a particular location; the successful transmission of information within the burial site depends on the monument's visual and oral effectiveness. As we have seen, the epigrams

---

[122] The epigram offers the equivalent of Homeric κλέος for the hero – access to the cultural memory; note the use of καλέειν, alluding to the newly accessible κλέος at the gravesite: κόρε κεκλέσομαι | αἰεί (CEG 24.1); cf. here A. Stecher, *Inschriftliche Grabgedichte auf Krieger und Athleten: Eine Studie zu griechischen Wertprädikationen* (Innsbruck, 1981) 20-1.

[123] Cf. Ecker 46.

themselves imagine their communication as stemming from their visual impact, followed by the reading and reaction of the readers; in the context of oralcy, this process is intensified by the epigram's use of traditional-referential diction or first- and second-person speech, which enable it to apply oral rhetorical strategies within a written and material medium. The diachronic effectiveness of the epigram is closely bound with its portrayal of the construction of the gravesite as an active response to grief, a notion already present in the Homeric poems; the placement of the burial site represents the final and visible act of departure from the dead, which marks the burial site and separates the domains of living and dead.[124] The spatial limitation and the durability of the inscribed memorial join to influence the epigram's negotiation between individual and collective values in the portrayal of the deceased – the individual epigram must remain relevant over multiple readings diachronically.

This relevance relies both on mediation between individual and collective values and on the epigram's prescriptive and paradigmatic function that outlines the significance of the monument for further transmission; the epigram's necessary diachronic significance in situ entails a widening of participants in its communication as well as of the meaning of the monument for the deceased and the mourners. The verse inscriptions at the gravesite are hardly separate from referential systems of other contemporary performative genres; their appeal to epic and elegiac referentiality lends both significance to the death and also marks the content of the inscription as information worthy of further transmission. Their place within the culture of oralcy is marked by these oral characteristics within the inscribed text of the epigram; yet they also display the new potential of script – the elementary connection of name and gravesite, the interpretation of the death as paradigm for the reader, and the ever more frequent grounding of the epigram in collectively accessible and even historical particulars.

---

[124] Sourvinou-Inwood 109.

[125] CEG 58.3 (ὃν τίεσκον Ἀθεναῖοι μετέοικον [Attica, ca. 510-500?]), 112.1 (ἀσστοῖ[ς] καὶ χσένοισι Φάνες φίλος [Boeotia, ca. 500?]), 128.1-2 (ἀνδρὶ ποθενδι ǀδάμοι [Locris Orientalis ca. 525-500?]), 143.2-6 (τόδε δ' αὐτδι δᾶμος ἐποίει.·ἐς γὰρ πρόξενϝος δάμου φίλος.... δαμόσιον δὲ καϙὸν [Corcyra ca. 625-600?]).

2.2 *Destroying his Youth: The Archaic Epigrams of Warriors*

Among the archaic epigrams, there is a marked emphasis on the collective relevance of the individual death, especially in connection with individuals who enjoy a particular status within the δῆμος[125] or in connection with those who have died in war.[126] The former group are characterized by explicit designation of both kinship and social roles of the deceased and the mourners and by themes of analogical reciprocity between the kin and the deceased and between the δῆμος and the deceased.[127] The existence of monuments erected by the kin and the δῆμος together and their parallel between familial and civic reciprocity reveals an increasing negotiation between individual and collective significance of death, dictated by the durability of the monument beyond the immediate generation and social setting.

When the epigrams of warriors treat extraordinary deaths, they maintain a coherent thematic trajectory from the Homeric γόος, where the lament focuses on the dead warrior as an supranormal deceased within the exceptional social context of wartime. The warriors' epigrams share the characteristics of the archaic epigrams in general, but are distinguished from them by their specificity about the situation and cause of death[128] and occasionally about the deceased's role as a warrior (αἰχμετô 19.1). As mentioned above, the theme of the 'beautiful death' persists from the Homeric and lyric traditions into the language of the epigram; the pitiful nature of the death[129], the youth (13.3, 136.3), and especially the martial activity of the deceased are emphasized in the archaic epigrams of warriors. While the majority of archaic epigrams use θανεῖν to mark a death, those epigrams clearly connected with warriors use ὄλεσθαι, both in transitive and intransitive forms.[130] The mainly transitive use of ὄλεσθαι attributes the death to Ares (CEG 27.2, 145.1) or even to the warrior himself, lending war and the warrior himself a new agency in the destruction and the resulting memorialization of the warrior's youth:

---

126 CEG 13, 19, 27, 47, 112, 136, 145, to be discussed further below.

127 μετέοικον, παιδὶ 58.3-6, ἀσστοῖ[ς] καὶ χσένοισι 112.1, πρόξενϝος, κασιγνέτοιο 143.2-6.

128 ἐν πολέμοι 13.3, 136.3; ἐν[ὶ] προμάχοις 27.2, 112.2; Ἄρες 27.2, 145.1; ἐ[ν δαΐ] 47i.3; ἀριστεύειν 112.2, 145.3.

129 Marked especially with οἰκτίρειν: CEG 13.2, 27.1.

130 Transitive CEG 13.3, 27.2, 136.3, 145.1, cf. Anacreon 2.1 West; Intransitive: CEG 47i.3.

[εἴτε ἀστό]ς τις ἀνὲρ εἴτε χσένος | ἄλοθεν ἐλθὸν :
Τέτιχον οἰκτίρα|ς ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν παρίτο, :
ἐν πολέμοι | φθίμενον, νεαρὰν hέβεν ὀλέσαν|τα. :
ταῦτ' ἀποδυράμενοι νε͂σθε ἐπ|ὶ πρᾶγμ' ἀγαθὸν.
(CEG 13, Attica, ca. 575-550?)

This emphasis on the agency of the warrior both in the martial context during life and in the active choice of death functions both as a contrast to the passivity of lament[131], and as a transformation of the death from a moment of separation to an active achievement.

Acknowledging the extraordinary death of a warrior, these epigrams minimize the roles of the donor, poet, sculptor, and even the σῆμα, omitting all other names from the grave monument except that of the deceased; while the warriors' epigrams address the reader (13, 27) or the deceased (19), they never personify the σῆμα as speaker. Thus, the deceased is situated no longer within the kinship or mourning group but in relation to the readers, whom he defends and among whom his martial activity determines his status:

ἀσστοῖς καὶ χσένοισι Φάνες φίλος [ἐνθάδε κεῖται], |
[hό]ς ποτ' ἀρισστεύον ἐν προμάχοις [ἔπεσε]
(CEG 112, Boeotia, ca. 500?).
Here lies Phanes, dear to citizens and ξένοι,
who once fell in the front lines, as he distinguished himself in battle.

Here, φίλος has a variable temporal aspect, signifying φίλος both before and after death, much like the later ἀγαθὸς γενόμενος, where death simultaneously preserves and generates the status of the deceased as φίλος.[132] With their direct transmission of memory apart from the immediate mourner(s), the warriors' epigrams situate themselves within a far wider public audience than that of the other archaic epigrams. They address the spectrum of social categories among their readers (ἀστός, ξένος 13, cf. 112) and thus engage themselves with a wider audience: πολοῖς μνᾶμα καὶ | [ἐσ]ομένοις (136.2). The present moment addressed by the warriors' epi-

[131] Considering the female associations of lament, the frequency of the gender designation ἀνήρ on the warrior's epigrams is also noteworthy: 13.2, 19.1, 47i.3, 136.3, cf. 19.2 ἐν[ορεέαν?].

[132] Cf. Thucydides' funeral oration of Pericles (ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργῳ γενομένων, 2.35.2) and N. Loraux, *The invention of Athens: The funeral oration in the Classical City* (Cambridge, MA, 1986) 100-6 on this expression and its significance in highlighting the connection between the warriors' decision to fight and their resulting attainment of a high status within the city as ἀγαθοί and as men.

grams no longer represents the results of death and passage, but of reading and reaction – the reader's recognition of the significance of the grave (γνό[σετ]αι, 19.2), mourning (οἰκτίρα|ς 13.2, οἴκτιρον 27.1, ἀποδυράμενοι 13.4) and aspiration to match the achievement of the deceased: οἰκτίρα|ς ἄνδρ' *ἀγαθὸν* παρίτο... νε̃σθε ἐπ|ὶ πρα̃γμ' *ἀγαθὸν*. (13.2-4). The present moment of engagement between the readers and the epigram mediates directly between the past moment of the warrior's 'beautiful' death (νεαρὰν hέβεν ὀλέσαν|τα 13.3) and the reader's future aspiration to similar behavior; this paradigmatic function of the epigram is further supplemented by the use of imperatives (νε̃σθε 13.4, στε̃θι | καὶ οἴκτιρον 28.2).

As a genre that communicates to an audience beyond the immediate kin to whom the deceased is familiar, the warriors' epigrams engage generally accessible diction from the oral-referential tradition describing the warrior's death. As I will show below, the epigrams employ various traditional vocabulary and formulae to describe the warrior's activity, ranging from large-scale encounters between groups to one-on-one combat; these traditional expressions negotiate between individual and collective values and balance the individual and collective portrayals of the deceased's martial activity and death. Where the epigram refers to war on a large scale (ἐν πολέμοι, 13.3, 136.3)[133], this corporate characterization of war is balanced by emphasis on the individual agency of the warrior:

> ϙοσίνα hυσεμάταν θάψα [π]|έλας hιποδρόμοιο
> ἄνδρα ἀ|[γα]θ[ὸ]ν, πολοῖς μνα̃μα καὶ | [ἐσ]ομένοις,
> ἐν πολέμοι [φθ]ίμενον νε|αρὰν hέβαν ὀλέσαντα,
> σόφρονα, ἀε(θ)λοφόρον καὶ σ|οφὸν hαλικίαι.
> (CEG 136, Argos, 525-500? BCE).
> I buried ϙosis with his fair σῆμα near the hippodrome,
> a noble man (a memorial for many, even for those in the future),
> who perished in war, destroying his fresh youth,
> moderate, a prize-bearer, and wise for his age.

This epigram juxtaposes personal attributes of the individual (ἄνδρα ἀ|[γα]θ[ὸ]ν, σόφρονα) with the collectivity of war (ἐν πολέμοι) and the accessibility of the warrior's memorial to multiple readers (πολοῖς μνα̃μα). The epigram bridges the divide between individuality and collectivity by

[133] The majority of uses of this phrase refer to large-scale martial encounters between two groups: *Il.* 5.861 (mass battle-cry), 8.234 (Agamemnon referring to the prior boasts of the Achaeans on their prowess in war), 12.271 (not all are equal in war), 14.149 (mass battle cry), 15.698 (Achaeans and Trojans at war), 16.591 (a javelin cast in war as a simile for the Trojan retreat), 21.610 (Trojan dead).

social typecasting of the dead individual: the individual actively sacrifices his youth in a group effort (ἐν πολέμοι [φθ]ίμενον νε | αρὰν hέβαν ὀλέσαντα) and his individual memorial remains accessible to multiple readers, present and future. This negotiation between individuality and collectivity matches the epigrams' communication to various groups in the polis ([εἴτε ἀστό]ς τις ἀνὲρ εἴτε χσένος 13.1; πολοῖς μνᾶμα καὶ | [ἐσ]ομένοις, 136.2), a collectivity reinforced by the use of the second person plural: ταῦτ' ἀποδυράμενοι νε͂σθε ἐπ | ὶ πρᾶγμ' ἀγαθὸν (13.4).

Regardless of variations in voice and diction, the warriors' epigrams situate the individual death within a collectively relevant context:

> στε͂θι : καὶ οἴκτιρον : Κροίσο | παρὰ σε͂μα θανόντος :
> hόν | ποτ' ἐνὶ προμάχοις : ὄλεσε | θο͂ρος : Ἄρες.
> (CEG 27, Attica, ca. 540-530?)
> Stand and take pity beside the σῆμα of the dead Kroisos,
> whom raging Ares once destroyed in the front lines.
>
> σᾶμα τόδε Ἀρνιάδα. χαροπὸς τόνδ' ὄλε | σεν Ἄρες
> βαρνάμενον παρὰ ναυσ | ὶν ἐπ' Ἀράθθοιο ῥhoϝαῖσι,
> πολλὸ | ν ἀριστεύ(ϝ)οντα κατὰ στονόϝεσαν ἀϝυτάν.
> (CEG 145, Corcyra, ca. 600? BCE)
> This is the σῆμα of Arniadas. Bright-eyed Ares destroyed him
> as he fought beside the ships at the streams of the Arathos,
> much distinguished in the groaning war-cry.

In CEG 27, the narration of the warrior's death begins hόν | ποτ'... (27.2, cf. 112.2) like an imbedded narrative in epic, so that the death of the warrior becomes definitive for his identity. In the Homeric poems, ὅς ποτε often marks an imbedded narrative of the past connected to the present through genealogy:

> τῶν αὖθ' ἡμεμόνευε Μέγης ἀτάλαντος Ἄρηϊ
> Φυλεΐδης, ὃν τίκτε διίφιλος ἱππότα Φυλεύς,
> ὅς ποτε Δουλίχιόνδ' ἀπενάσσατο πατρὶ χολωθείς.
> (*Il.* 2.627-9[134])

The presence of this mode of narration in a grave epigram suggests a transmission of warrior's memory simultaneously among his kinship

[134] Cf. *Il.* 2.547 (Erechtheus' genealogy), 629 (genealogy of Meges), 4.474 (genealogy of Simoeisios), 5.640 (Tlepolemos' genealogy), 11.139 (genealogy of the twin sons of Antimachos), 23.679 (genealogy of Euryalos), *Od.* 2.46 (Telemachus on the loss of his father), 3.84 (Telemachus on Odysseus), 11.284 (geneaology of Chloris).

group (drawing on the genealogical aspect) and among his cultural group at large (drawing on the epic phrase). The individuality of the warrior within the group context is emphasized by ἐνὶ προμάχοις, a formula used of individual combat within a collective martial effort. Similarly, the gravestone of Arniadas (CEG 145) features Homeric language (παρὰ ναυσ|ὶν, στονόϝεσαν ἀϝυτάν) and motifs (Ares as agent of death, death beside the ships[135]) that praise his death by characterizing it in heroic terms, yet situate it within a collective value system (πολλὸ|ν ἀριστεύ(ϝ)οντα[136]). This collective element is expanded further by specific details of the location of Arniadas' death (ἐπ' Ἀράθθοιο ῥhoϝαῖσι), a feature unusual both in the Homeric lament and in the other archaic epigrams. While geographic specificity connotes an individualization of Arniadas' death, this linking of his death with a particular location serves a collective function as well, in that it anchors the individual death at a generally familiar location, both endowing the location with new significance and allowing collective access to this significance. While this epigram employs referential ways of talking about martial activity and death, it also grounds its memorialization in historical reality; the use of traditional diction highlights the activity of the warrior in the past, while the present memorialization of the death remains anchored in the gravesite and in the geography familiar to the reader. The epigram thus mediates between past and present, and between individual praise and collective accessibility; its endurance depends on this social relevance communicated to a broadened audience at the spatially limited but chronologically durable gravesite.

The archaic warrior's epigram transforms the crisis of death into a transition from heroic action and death to a future of memory; it depicts the warrior's past action of death in heroic diction and emphasizes the agency of the reader, who reacts to the epigram's message with recognition, mourning, and aspiration to follow its ethical paradigm. The epigram negotiates between individual and collective both in its presentation of the past in traditional-referential terms and in its historical and parainetic communication to the reader. The inscribed epigram resolves the traditional question of active death and mourning posed in epic and

---

[135] Cf. Ecker 70-87 on this epigram.

[136] Homeric ἀριστεύειν usually connotes the martial excellence of the individual warrior which is recognized as insuring the security of his group, as in scenes of rout where the warrior described with ἀριστεύειν is killed: *Il.* 6.208, 460, 7.90, 11.746, 16.292, 551, *Od.* 4.652.

elegy by associating death itself with the warrior's agency and by connecting mourning with the reciprocal activity of construction and reading the monument. When it negotiates between the past death and the reader's continual present, and between individual and collective value in death, the epigram represents an answer to the traditional problems associated with mourning. It also looks forward to features familiar from the memorials of the classical period, such as the Athenian casualty lists[137]: individual detail (place, date and contexts of death), position of the deceased within a non-kin social grouping (the deceased's identity as warrior, the omission of the names of kin, donor, and sculptor), and interplay between individual death and collective significance, upon which the transmission into cultural memory depends.

2.3 *The Persian War Epigrams and the Passage to the Classical Period*

The various developments seen in the archaic epigrams above are brought to completion in the Persian War epigrams (IG I^2 503/504), three or more fragments of a monument inscribed in stoichedon in ca. 480-470 BCE.[138] In the early fifth century, the Athenian culture of public memorials for the dead is just beginning – the first public casualty list will be in 465/4 BCE – and the Persian War epigrams represent one of the first examples of collective epigraphic commemoration of warriors[139]:

A I
ἀνδρôν τôνδ'[140] ἀρετε̂[ς ?*ἔσται κλέ]ος ἄφθι[τον*[141]] αἰεί [:]
[....9.....]ν[.]ρ[....ca.7...] νέμοσι θεοί·]

---

[137] On the casualty list, see D. W. Bradeen, 'Athenian Casualty Lists,' *Hesperia* 33 (1964): 16-62 and 'The Athenian Casualty Lists,' *CQ* 19 (1969): 145-159 and G. Smith, 'Athenian Casualty Lists,' *CP* 14 (1919): 351-364. The casualty list is an annual listing of the names of those fallen in war, arranged according to Athenian tribe or non-Athenian identity and marked together with the place of death, forming an analogue to the social stratification seen in the archaic cemetary.

[138] Russell Meiggs and David Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1969) 55; based on differences in lettering, A and B could be anywhere from contemporary to fifteen years apart.

[139] Homeric formulae are underlined, phraseology found in lyric, elegy and epinician are in large font.

[140] Hom. *Il.* 9.559 (ἀνδρῶν / τῶν τότε) marks a narration of the geneaology of a hero of the past (Meleager); perhaps the phrase here marks the commemoration of the warriors as information about the past.

[141] Hom. *Il.* 9.413 (Achilles), Ibycus S151.47 (poet and his poetry bring Polykrates κλέος).

ἔσχον γὰρ πεζοί τε [καὶ *ὀκυπόρον ἐπὶ νεȏ]ν*[142]: / hελλά[δα μ]ὲ πᾶσαν[143] *δούλιο[ν*
ἐ̑μαρ[144] ἰδε̂ν:].

AII

ἐν ἄρα τοῖσζ' ἀδαμ[α ⏖ – ⏖ – ⏑] hότ' αἰχμὲν
       στε̂σαμ πρόσθε πυλȏν αν [⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –]
ἀνχίαλομ πρε̂σαι ρ ⏖ – ⏖ – ⏖ – ⏓
       ἄστυ βίαι Περσȏν κλινάμενο[ι ⏑ ⏑ –].

B

[– ⏖ – ⏖ – ⏖ – πε]ζοί τε και – ⏓ / – ⏖ – ⏖ – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –
– ⏖ – ⏖ – ⏖ – ⏖ – ⏑ ο νε̂σοι / [– ⏖ – ⏖ – – ⏑ ⏑ – ἔ]βαλον.

C

hέρκος γὰρ προπάροιθεν ⏑ – ⏖ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏓ ⁽ / ΤΕΣ ⏖ – ⏖ μεμ Παλλάδος hιπο | ⏑ – /
οὖθαρ δ' ἀπείρο πορτιτρόφο ἄκρον ἔχοντες ⁽
       τοῖσιμ πανθαλὲς ὄλβος ἐπιστρέ | [φεται].

While some oral-traditional motifs persist here, such as κλέος ἄφθιτον (AI.1), the tendencies we have seen in the archaic warriors' epigrams are further developed in the Persian War epigrams: the active portrayal of death, historical and geographical specificity, and the replacement of private mourning with the collective and politically significant commemoration of death.

There are significant questions about the shape and function of this monument and about the events to which it refers. The monument on which the epigram were inscribed has been variously identified as a cenotaph, or as a war memorial bearing herms or stelai with casualty lists. As the Athenian dead at Marathon were buried on the battlefield in the Soros, the monument is most likely neither a tomb nor a cenotaph, which is strictly used for the unrecoverable dead; the monument is most likely to be identified as a war-memorial honoring the dead in the city of their origin.[145] Cuttings in the fragments suggest that objects were mounted on the monument; while some have proposed two or three herms flanking the

---

142 ὀκυπόρον ἐπὶ νεȏ]ν: Hom. *Il.* 1.421, 488 (Achilles grieving beside the ships), 2.351 (sailing of the Achaean fleet), 10.308 (Hector motivates the Trojans to approach the Achaean ships), 320, 442 (Dolon spying near the Achaean ships), 12.156 (Achaean defense of ships), 13.58 (Aiantes to push Hector back from ships), 110 (Achaean defense of their ships), *Od.* 4.708 (Telemachus' journey), 5.176 (Odysseus on sailing from Kalypso's island), 14.230 (Odysseus' Cretan lie); Pindar *Pyth.* 1.74-6 (Syracusan naval victory).

143 Pindar *Ol.* 13.113, Xenoph. fr. 6.5.

144 Hom. *Il.* 6.463 (Andromache in slavery), *Od.* 14.340 (Odysseus' Cretan lie), 17.323 (Eumaeus on slavery).

145 D. L. Page, ed., *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1981) 220.

text[146], the spatial construction of the monument and the deictics τõνδ' (AI.1) and τοĩσζ' (AII.1), which appear to modify the same persons[147], strongly suggest stelai with names of the deceased engraved on them[148] or simply intentional affinity to a gravestone (cf. the formulaic τόδε σῆμα).[149] Whatever its function, the monument commemorates the death of the Athenian warriors fighting the Persians and understands their death as a defense of Athens and Greek freedom, as well as an ἀρετέ to be rewarded on human and divine levels.

The mention of ships in AI and fire in the city in AII has led to the supposition that the first epigram (AI) refers to Salamis, probably together with other martial encounters of the second Persian War, and that the second epigram AII refers to Marathon.[150] After the discovery of a fourth-century copy of the epigram restoring AI.2 with ὀκυπόρον ἐπὶ νεõ]ν, few scholars continued to support the former theory that the entire monument commemorates Marathon alone.[151]

---

[146] B. D. Merritt, 'Epigrams from the Battle of Marathon,' in Saul S. Weinberg, ed., *The Aegean and the Near East: Studies presented to H. Goldman* (1956): 268-280, esp. 274-280; Merritt's arguments for the herm solution are based on the similarity of the Persian War epigrams to the Eion monuments which bore herms and on the spatial limitations of the monument which would better accomodate herms than stelai (though see John Barron, 'All for Salamis,' in '*Owls to Athens*': *Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* ed. E. M. Craik (Oxford, 1990): 135 for the exactly opposite argument).

[147] Cf. also τοĩσιμ in C; see Barron 139 and B. D. Merritt, 'The Marathon Epigrams Again,' *AJP* 83 (1962): 294-8, especially 297-8 on the identity of τõνδ' and τοĩσζ'.

[148] Barron 136, cf. P. Amandry, 'Sur les "Epigrammes de Marathon",' *Theoria: Festschrift W.-H. Schuchhardt* (1960): 8, Page *Further Greek Epigrams* 222-3.

[149] Page *Further Greek Epigrams* 223.

[150] Various scholars support this theory, but in slightly differing forms: Meiggs and Lewis 56-7 argue that the monument began with a commemoration of Salamis, to which an epigram about Marathon was later added (n.b. AII in rasura); Page *Further Greek Epigrams* 220-2 sees AI as referring to Salamis and Psytalleia or Salamis (perhaps with Mykale) as a naval battle and Plataea as a land battle, i.e. the war as a whole. Page sees the addition of the Marathon epigram AII as a replacement of a hypothetical monument of 490 BCE; otherwise its addition 'as an afterthought becomes and will remain inexplicable (222).' W. Kendrick Pritchett, *Marathon* (Berkeley, 1960) 161-2 views the monument as a commemoration of Salamis, using comparanda from Aesch. *Persae*; the monument would be designed to accomodate mention of Marathon, rather than that AII was added later as an afterthought or as a replacement of a monument of 490 BCE; K. W. Welwei, 'Die "Marathon Epigramme von der athenischen Agora",' *Historia* 19 (1970): 299-303 argues that the monument commemorates all the dead of the Persian Wars collectively, with specific mention of Marathon in AII; cf. also F. Hiller v. Gaertringen, 'Perserepigramme von der athenischen Agora,' *Hermes* 69 (1934): 204-206 and W. Peek, 'Zu den Perser-Epigrammen,' *Hermes* 88 (1960): 498-9.

[151] Merritt (1956): 272-3, for example, sees the Persian War monument as a reconstruction of a hypothetical monument to Marathon from 490BCE, destroyed in the second Persian War and rebuilt with a reference to both Persian Wars (AI) and with a copy of the

Barron's view (137-140) that both AI and II refer to Salamis in combination with another battle (Mycale, Plataea, and perhaps Artemisium) or alone (i.e. to Aristides' engagement on Psytalleia and Themistocles' naval battle) is highly problematic. He questions whether Athens can aptly be described as ἀνχίαλομ (AII.2), an adjective which may better and more traditionally describe Salamis[152]; the imprecision of this epithet should not overshadow the traditional identification of Marathon as the battle where the burning of Athens was prevented. The other problem Barron highlights is the middle voice of κλινάμενο[ι, which he argues should not be understood as an active deflection of Persian force, but as a defeat: 'sinking under Persian violence (139)'; this participle would refer to those who did not join Themistocles, but remained in the city – an argument Barron buttresses with the mention of a hέρκος, which he associates with the ancient wooden fence surrounding Athens (139). Barron's argument is doubtful for several reasons: 1) Other uses of the middle participle κλινάμενος are unattested (cf. LSJ s.v. κλίνω), leaving open an equal possibility that the middle voice indicates the deflection of enemy force in one's own self-interest. 2) It is questionable whether a monument commemorating the dead warriors of the Persian War would commemorate those dead who had remained in the city in parallel with those who fought in the martial encounter at Salamis. 3) Throughout the poetic tradition, including the Homeric poems, hέρκος has a metaphorical meaning of 'defense,' used of warriors.[153] Where the emphasis on the warriors' (τôνδ', τοῖσζ', τοῖσιμ) defense of Athens is predominant, there is no need to introduce another battle location to interpret hέρκος; as the beginning of each section mentions the warriors (ἀνδρôν τôνδ', τοῖσζ'), the reading of hέρκος at the outset of C as referring to the warriors would provide a neat parallel. Barron's readings hardly necessitate the identification of AII with Salamis; therefore, in the following discussion, I am following the general scholarly consensus that the Persian War memorial commemorates

original epigram to Marathon (AII). Merritt puts forth the theory that AI.2 refers both to fighting at and on the Persian ships followed by a rout on land (271), a plausible but difficult reading as ἐπί suggests fighting on one's own ships and the mention of ships with πεζοί seems to be a periphrasis for infantry and naval contigents on the Athenian side (cf. Pritchett 163). Cf. also Merritt 1962: 294-8, who argues further for identification with Marathon based on the reference to the burning of Athens and the highly unlikely juxtaposition of two 'unrelated' inscriptions on the same stone; the mention of Marathon hardly excludes the possible commemoration of other battles, such as Salamis, as they are all related as martial encounters with the Persians.

152 Aesch. *Pers.* 888-895, Soph. *Ajax* 134, Geminus *AP* 9.288.3.

153 e.g. ἕρκος... πολέμοιο, of footsoldiers (*Il.* 4.299), see *LSJ* s.v. 4b.

Salamis and perhaps other naval and land encounters of 480/479 BCE in a format which allows for inclusion of references back to the events of 490 BCE as a parallel.

With the phrase πεζοί τε [καὶ ὀκυπόρον ἐπὶ νεõ]ν (AI.2), AI refers to a combination of infantry and naval power, suggesting Salamis and perhaps implying other martial encounters, including Marathon; AI equates the infantry and naval engagement of these warriors for the cause of Greek freedom with a masculine ἀρετέ that earns κλέος and recompense from the gods. AII similarly characterizes the warriors of Marathon as ἀδαμ[α and active in their defense of Athens (αἰχμὲν / στε̃σαμ) and their deflection of the Persian offensive. B and C, which appear to be connected by the γάρ of C.1, celebrate the warriors' defense of land (πεζοί B.1, οὖθαρ δ' ἀπείρο πορτιτρόφο ἄκρον ἔχοντες C.1) and perhaps islands (νε̃σοι B.2) which will be rewarded with ὄλβος. The monument begins with a global view of the events of 480/479 BCE and their significance for Greece as a whole, narrowing its scope to the Athenian warriors in AII and in B-C, where the epigrams turn from specific historical encounters to a larger paradigmatic trend of ὄλβος exchanged for martial excellence. Each segment begins with an abstract or metaphorical characterization of the deceased (ἀρετέ, ἀδαμ[α, hέρκος) followed by a more concrete and historically grounded description of their martial activity (ἔσχον γάρ..., αἰχμὲν / στε̃σαμ..., ...ἄκρον ἔχοντες) and its results: freedom from slavery, deflection of the Persian attack, and the attainment of ὄλβος.

If the Persian War epigrams are interpreted as a war-memorial of 480-470 BCE[154] for naval and land battles of 480/479 BCE with reference to Marathon, we see multiple new developments extending those we have seen above in the archaic epigrams. First, the Persian War epigrams are historically grounded; beyond reference to various referential-traditional phrases (e.g. κλέος ἄφθιτον), the battles of the second Persian War are seen against the background of a historical battle rather than in analogy to the traditional or Homeric warrior. The warriors and their opponents are clearly mentioned (hελλά[δα AI.2, Περσõν AII.2), and the very fact of the Marathon epigram AII being included in a monument of the later time period 480-470 BCE signifies its paradigmatic nature as a hoplite battle, as the definitive Greek encounter with the Persians (i.e. the barbarian world) and as the definitive Athenian battle, set in a position of analo-

---

[154] See Amandry 2 on the rough surface of stone with the polished surface for AII as typical of Athenian bases of 480-470 BCE.

gy to the battles of 480-479 BCE.[155] This historic specificity is typical of written rhetoric, which no longer relates the individual event to the referential tradition for relevance (i.e. the 'homeostatic' culture)[156], but here even establishes an analogical relationship between two historical events – Marathon and the battle(s) of 480-479 BCE.

The nature of the monument is encomiastic, with paradigmatic significance for the reader.[157] The Persian War epigrams continue the interpretation of the warrior's death as active (στε̑σαμ, βίαι) and masculine (ἀνδρο̑ν το̑νδ'). The martial defense of Greece is understood as ἀρετέ (ἀνδρο̑ν το̑νδ' ἀρετέ...ἔσχον γάρ... AI.1-2), which is rewarded both by long-term memory within the social group (κλέος) and by divine recompense (νέμοσι θεοί·], AI.1, πανθαλὲς ὄλβος, C.2). The epigrams place emphasis on collectivity, as can be seen in the predominantly plural or corporate singular terms in the text (e.g. ἀνδρο̑ν, ἄστυ); by contrast, the terms for the recompense of the warriors' action appear in the singular (κλέος, ὄλβος), suggesting a shared memorialization as a common reward for collective action. The interplay between the fates of Athens (ἀνχίαλομ ...ἄστυ AII.2, Παλλάδος hυπο C.1) and Greece as a whole (hελλά[δα...]... πα̑σαν AI.2) also serves as an analogical pairing of individual and collective fates involved in the Persian War. Where the earliest funerary epigrams move away from the transitional chronological sequences of lament, they focus on a continual present – the stable identity of the deceased and the diachronic communication with individual readers. In the Persian War epigrams, the warriors' past activity (ἔσχον, στε̑σαμ) prevents the potential slavery of Greece to the Persian empire (δούλιο[ν ε̑μαρ ἰδε̑ν] AI.1) and connects with the honor represented by the monument and the reaction to the monument in a continual present: ...[κλέος ἄφθιτον] αἰεί, νέμοσι θεοί·], πανθαλὲς ὄλβος, ἐπιστρέ|[φεται]. This connection of past and momentary activity (ε̑μαρ) with continued fame and recompense in the present (αἰεί) wholly obscures the moment of death; this chronological continuity lends the epigrams a gnomic function, in which they reinforce

[155] In Athenian ideology, Marathon represents the first differentiation of Athens from the barbarian world and from the rest of Greece. On the paradigmatic position of Marathon as the definitive Athenian battle, viewed as representative of the superiority of the Athenian political system, see N. Loraux, 'Marathon ou l'Histoire idéologique,' *REA* 75 (1973): 13-42, esp. 16-17, 40. Cf. also Pierre Vidal-Naquet, 'La Tradition de l'Hoplite Athénien,' in J.-P. Vernant, ed., *Problèmes de la guerre en Grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1963) 168 on the importance of Marathon as the paradigmatic battle representative of hoplite solidarity.

[156] Goody and Watt 30-4, 53-6.

[157] Peek 495-7.

the general validity of the parallel human and the divine rewards for proper action embodied by the monument recording the specific case of the Persian War.

The Persian War epigrams display some affinities to the referential traditions of epic and lyric genres; yet, like the archaic epigrams, their texts display singular formulae and poetic strategies which experience an independent literary diffusion.[158] As in the archaic epigrams, there is alliteration and assonance[159], joined here by wordplay (πρε̃σαι... Περσο̃ν, in the same metrical position) and parallelism (ἀνδρο̃ν... θεοί AI.1). While the epigrams' text as a whole maintains affinities to traditional diction, it is noteworthy that traditional diction is concentrated in AI, while AII, B, and C have solely thematic but no significant linguistic resonances in other poetic genres; this suggests that AI functions as a general introduction to the combined naval and infantry defense of Greece in the Persian Wars. The traditional diction in AI refers to and often transforms traditional language about heroic activity and its contrast: ἀνδρο̃ν το̃νδ', [κλέος ἄφθιτον], [ὀκυπόρον ἐπὶ νεο̃]ν, hελλά[δα]...πα̃σαν, δούλιο[ν ἒμαρ]. The reference to κλέος ἄφθιτον (AI.1) recalls the traditional Indo-European concept of divine rewards in material and eventually in the abstract form of fame or poetic celebration that preserve the individual's activity (*Il.* 9.413) or identity (Ibycus S151.47) after death.[160] Fusing the various aspects of this formula, the Persian War epigrams embody this recompense for the warrior's death in a material monument that perpetuates an abstract memory. The description of the martial activity of the warriors likewise draws on traditional diction, but also adopts newly abstract usages; δούλιο[ν ἒμαρ], a traditional phrase used of persons, now modifies the abstract and collective hελλά[δα]...πα̃σαν. Traditionally, the Homeric formula embodies the marginalization and passivity connected with the definitive day on which slavery is imposed, and so again suggests the positive activity of the dead warriors in preserving the activity of Greece itself:

[158] Cf. Barron 140-1 on the echoes of AII in *Pythian* 1.73-5 (composed in 470 BCE for Hieron of Syracuse) , suggesting a parallel between the Syracusan defeat of the western barbarians and the Athenian defeat of eastern barbarians:
οἷα Συρακοσίων ἀρχῷ δαμασθέντες πάθον,
ὠκυπόρων ἀπὸ ναῶν ὅ σφιν ἐν πόντῳ βάλεθ' ἁλικίαν,
'Ελλάδ' ἐξέλκων βαρείας δουλίας.
[159] *ἀνδρο̃ν το̃νδ' ἀρετέ, πεζοί τε* [καὶ ὀκυπόρον ἐπὶ νεο̃]ν, hελλά[δα μ]ὲ πα̃σαν
δούλιο[ν ἒμαρ ἰδε̃ν·], πρόσθε πυλο̃ν, etc.
[160] See Edwin D. Floyd, 'Kleos aphthiton: An Indo-European Perspective on Early Greek Poetry,' *Glotta* 58 (1980): 133-156, especially 154-5 for Greek and Sanskrit comparanda that show the root meaning of the phrase is connected with reward from the gods.

...σοὶ δ' αὖ νέον ἔσσεται ἄλγος
χήτεϊ τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν δούλιον ἦμαρ
(*Il.* 6.462-3 [Hector to Andromache])

ἥμισυ γάρ τ' ἀρετῆς ἀποαίνυται εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
ἀνερός, εὖτ' ἄν μιν κατὰ δούλιον ἦμαρ ἕλῃσιν
(*Od.* 17.322-3 [Eumaeus to Od.])

In *Od.* 17.322-3, Eumaeus' parallel between the δούλιον ἦμαρ and the loss of ἀρετή highlights the significance of the monument's commemoration of the warriors' ἀρετή (AI.1), which is rooted in their defense of Greece against slavery and, implicitly, the loss of ἀρετή. Yet while the Homeric poems define freedom only at its loss on the day of slavery, the historical moment of the Persian Wars marks a shift from martial rhetoric emphasizing material or political gain to one that emphasizes freedom as its goal, an aspect shared by other contemporary monuments to individuals and groups involved in the Persian Wars.[161] AI thus serves as a paradigmatic and traditionally marked preface to the historically based commemoration of the Persian Wars and the defense of Athens, itself detached from traditional language and rooted in historical and geographic specificity. The phraseology of the Persian War epigrams reemerges in other monuments associated with the Persian War, first and foremost the concepts of Ἑλλὰς πᾶσα[162] and an ἦμαρ connected with freedom or slavery of Greece.[163] The development of a diction specific to the epigrams transmitted side by side with traditional diction demonstrates the new autonomy of the warriors' epigrams, which draw their reference points both from oral-traditional material and identifiable historical events, while also participating in exchange with other written texts which celebrate these events.

The Persian War epigrams show various endpoints of the developments we have seen in the archaic funerary epigrams – the characterization of death itself as active, the suppression of death and mourning as theme, the paradigmatic function of the epigram for the reader, and the historical grounding of the warrior's death in relation to paradigmatic events such as the battle at Marathon. The Persian War monument commemorates the death of warriors while never explicitly mentioning death

---

[161] Kurt Raaflaub, *Die Entdeckung der Freiheit* (Munich, 1985) 38-41, 76-9.
[162] οὗτος Ἀδειμάντου κεῖνου τάφος, ὃν διὰ *πᾶσα / Ἕλλας* ἐλευθερίας ἀμφέθετο στέφανον Page X (98B., 94 D.), cf. Page XII (97 B, 95D).
[163] Cf. Page XVI.1-2 (107B., 96 D).

verbally and in all likelihood not being physically connected with a gravesite. These epigrams further minimize the role of mourners, donors, and even the names of the deceased, if we are not to see stelai with casualty lists implied by the deictic pronouns here; the exchange formed by the gravesite takes place beyond the immediate circle of kin and mourners in parallel Athenian civic, panhellenic, and divine realms where collective action is answered by shared recompense and memory. The language of the Persian War epigrams negotiates between traditional diction and a new formulaic and thematic referentiality grounded in the historic past and enabled by the presence of writing.[164] As opposed to homeostatic culture, which continually re-evaluates received information, the historic reference in writing allows a new level of collective commemoration in which the mourners, death, and perhaps even the deceased and the nature of the monument itself are no longer necessarily identified. Much of the paradigmatic and analogical function of the Persian War epigrams is also determined by the presence of written reference to historical reality and the significance of the monument: the monument draws parallels between Marathon and the events of 480/479 BCE, between the interdependence of Athens and its warriors, between Greece and Athens, and finally between the commemoration of specific warriors in the monument and the general validity of the rewards of κλέος or ὄλβος for martial activity. These analogies between different levels of action displace the loss constituted by death and replace it with a theme of agency, both in the warriors' active defense of Athens and Greece and in the Athenians' action of erecting the monument to their memory; this motif of agency remains grounded in the concreteness of the monument and the continued verbal and physical accessibility of the historical reference enabled by writing.

These various features particular to the inscribed monument point to the collective significance of writing and its potential for political instrumentalization. Scholarly debate about the political potential of writing is polarized, with some seeing writing as a democratic tool in the codifica-

[164] Cf. Chester G. Starr, *The Awakening of the Greek Historical Spirit* (NY, 1968) 83, 147 on the various inscribed material objects set up in Athens from at least the fifth century BCE onward, which often display a conscious interest in preserving historical information as an anchor for oral memory: the eponymous archon lists, the memorials to battle victories (both trophies at the battlefield and dedications at home or in international centers), the individual gravestones with reference to historical events (tombstone of Pythion IG I^2 1085), and the recutting of old inscriptions.

tion of laws[165] and in the creation of general access to knowledge, law, and political participation[166], while others see it as a catalyst for increased social differentiation: elite controlled access to texts and changes in writing technology, script or education that cause social stratification[167], as well as uses of historiography or inscriptions to buttress the aims of social groups or regimes.[168] The archaic funerary monuments with their epigrams display both democratic and elitist tendencies. The inscribed funer-

---

[165] Steiner 239-242 discusses the dual nature of codification – it protects citizen rights by providing and preserving access to information, while it likewise consolidates the position of the state through the creation of written markers. Similarly, Rosalind Thomas ('Literacy and the city-state in archaic and classical Greece,' *Literacy and Power in the ancient world* ed. Alan K. Bowman and Greg Wolff (Cambridge, 1994): 35) shows how contemporary Greek views of writing in the state ranges from idealistic and democratic to distrustful.

[166] From the fifth century BCE onward, the total number of public inscriptions in democratic Athens increases dramatically, straddling purposes of general access to written information and consolidation of state power: written decrees (e.g. the coinage decree, erected on stelai at the mints of allies), increased use of archives and written documentation in courts, religious dedications, codified laws, inscribed financial records (e.g. tribute lists); cf. Thomas 43-49. Also, as Goody and Watt (39-42) note, the Greek alphabetic system offers more 'democratic' means of written expression which reproduces the basic phonemic system common to all human physiology, thus favoring the social diffusion of writing. Writing is a precondition of multiple politically significant activities in Athens from the sixth century onward: consulting codified law, ostracism, and attendance of schools; though the laboriousness of copying and the lack of separations between inscribed words would present some obstacles for the Greek reader or writer, the Semitic languages require specialists who are incorporated into the existing political elite (Goody and Watt 42). By contrast to other previous and contemporary Near Eastern literate cultures, Greek literacy lacked an official aspect to the language (e.g. isolation of writing within power institutions, scribes as writing specialists), and so offered potential for more general access to written communication (Assmann 267-8). Despite these relatively favorable conditions in Greece, widespread access to writing remains confined, in that written texts outside of codified law and inscribed monuments remain restricted to individuals (inscribed possessions) or to limited audiences (privately owned written texts); cf. Steiner 201-214. Steiner 228-9 further argues that this split between publicly accessible and privately circulated writing in Athens corresponds to two different uses of writing: instrumental (e.g. codification of law and decrees, a communication participated in and received by larger groups) and theoretical (self-consciously written, private texts circulated among limited groups). The funerary epigrams defy this opposition, functioning both instrumentally (communication to the wider social group, diachronic relevance of individual memory) and among private groups (the restriction of access to the construction and the inscription of gravesites to the elite, references to kin recognizable only to the family).

[167] Jack Goody, *The interface between the written and the oral* (Cambridge, 1987) 140-6. While writing allows some social mobility (i.e. a new potential for achievement not connected to birth), the effects of literacy often stratify social groups between literate and illiterate and remove direct personal contact from social and political transactions, possibly limiting direct access to political machinery (cf. Steiner 246-7).

[168] Alan K. Bowman and Greg Woolf, 'Literacy and Power in the ancient world,' *Literacy and Power in the ancient world* ed. Alan K. Bowman and Greg Wolff (Cambridge , 1994): 1-16, esp. 6-8.

ary monument departs from the homeostasis of oral society and stabilizes historical references in the memorials of the dead; by contrast to the oral lament celebrating ritual passage among kin, the more durable funerary monument serves as a preserver of memory originating as the product of ritual and based on individual and collective belonging. Writing extends communication from its context within ritual *action* and associates it increasingly with exchange of personal, social, and historical *information*.[169] The written epigram diversifies the communication between donor of the stele, the author of the epigram, the monument (or the persona of the deceased), and the reader; its commemoration of the mourning for the deceased lends the inscribed monument a range of functions as a historical record, an object of reciprocity, and an aesthetic medium. While writing allows for the access of all readers and listening audiences to the memory of individual dead, the public monument enables further collective commemoration of the deceased, exemplifying group values (CEG 143); references to collectively accessible historical and geographical information in both individual and corporate epigrams likewise allow the genre to retain public relevance.

Yet, by contrast to the general lack of censorship of written materials in Greek culture, the funerary monuments are the one written medium which is state-controlled through funerary legislation, or perhaps even forbidden during the marked decrease in private monuments in the first half of the fifth century BCE, and appropriated by the state to some extent through the development of public memorials.[170] State-sponsored monuments represent the grave monument's potential for democratic expression through broad popular access to the inscription as public information but they also reveal the blurring of democratic and aristocratic values in their representation of the dead. Despite the relatively public nature of the inscribed monument, the cost of the individual stone and its inscription remain potentially prohibitive, and the values espoused by the epigram or by visual representations on the monument therefore often reflect those of the elite. The political role of writing on the funerary monument thus evades any exclusive association with democratic or elite advances. Rather, it shows itself as an adaptive medium with potential for use in both democratic and aristocratic spheres: ultimately, the chronological durability and the broader audiences available to the inscribed

---

[169] Walter Ong, 'Writing is a Technology that Restructures Thought,' in Gerd Bauman, ed., *The Written Word: Literacy in Transition* (Oxford, 1986) 36.

[170] Thomas 38-40.

monument enable it to assume various political functions, both of stratification and of democratization. The flexibility of writing in aligning itself with public and private, elite and democratic functions determines the broadening use of script as medium, and, as we shall see below, it also intensifies the questions of public and private priorities in both oral and written memorialization throughout the classical period.

CHAPTER THREE

ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΑ ΤΑΔΕ: CASE STUDIES IN CLASSICAL MOURNING

In the preceding two chapters, I have studied our evidence for oral lament and written memorialization down to the beginnings of the classical period. Various characteristics of early Greek memorialization of the dead remain constant: the concern with the beautiful death, the special attention given in both oral and written media to the extraordinary deaths of youths and warriors, and the question of passivity or activity in response to death. If we view the Homeric representation of lament as an indicator of traditional attitudes toward the form, function, and problems of oral lament and media of mourning in oral society, the written memorial involves various shifts in the dynamics of memorialization, most of which can be connected with the inscribed epigram's limited spatial efficacy and its diachronic durability:

1) A shift from the treatment of ritual passage in lament to the funerary monument, which records the final reintegration of the deceased among the stable dead and the mourners among the community of the living. The diachronic durability of the epigram necessitates the suppression of the liminality of death ritual and the gravemarker's resulting focus on recording the completed ritual act as well as the stable identity of the deceased and their mourners.

2) A shift from a focus on mastering an immediate ritual passage (e.g. the chronological bridging done by the γόος) to preserving memory, exemplified by the function of the σῆμα as μνῆμα, the essential connection of the name of the deceased with the gravesite, and the grounding of the deceased's identity in historical, social, or geographical particulars. Here again, the diachrony of the inscribed material gravemarker necessitates the suppression of the liminal moment of death; the function of recording and reinforcing memory is linked with the general trend away from homeostasis with the arrival of writing, a trend which comes to its fullest expression in the increasing historical reference in epigrams, as for example in the Persian War monument.

3) A shift from memorialization among the immediate kin to the involvement of larger groups in memorialization and the resulting typological portrayal of the deceased according to their social role. As a result of the

inscribed gravemarker's involvement of multiple actors in the construction of the gravesite and its greater accessibility to a larger public over time, its relevance to these groups expands to include more references to the deceased's place within the larger contemporary and future communities reading the text.

4) A shift from the prominence of the deceased and the individual mourner to a spectrum of interrelated visual and verbal communications between the donor(s) of the stele, the author of the epigram, the monument, the social persona of the deceased, and the reader.[1] The range of communicative exchanges at the monument in first-, second-, and third-person formats with both oral and written characteristics reflects the absence of the author whose medium, the gravemarker, continues communication beyond his / her immediate presence. This multiplicity of exchanges communicated by the gravesite is paralleled by the monument's own multiplicity of functions as a marker, an object of reciprocity, and an aesthetic emblem of the deceased's physical and ethical beauty.

5) A shift away from the Homeric opposition between the passivity of verbal lament and active mourning expressed in material memorials such as large-scale ritual and monuments. With the presence of writing, the active construction and inscription of the gravesite comes to fuse verbal and material forms of memory. In contrast to the singular and private performance of ritual lament, the active construction and the diachrony of the gravesite allow for a motif of reciprocity to emerge; the construction of funerary monuments and their ongoing generation and preservation of memory serve as a recompense for the deceased's activity in life. The permanence of the monument likewise allows the epigram's aesthetics to be viewed as paralleling the ephemeral beauty of the death through its pleasurable verbal and visual communication diachronically.

6) A shift from opposition between the singular, ephemeral women's lament and the traditional epic commemorating the warrior's lifetime of activity to the epigram's commemoration of the warrior's now-stable death qua act in itself and the particular marcation of the warriors' graves with epic diction. The permanence and the active, positive nature of the inscribed gravesite allows the epigram to praise the deceased and to record a death as a behavioral paradigm for the living; by contrast, the epic tradition limits itself to the living hero as exemplum, while the lament signals the end of the hero's life cycle and efficacy.

[1] n.b. also the increasing visibility of the mourners on the monument with the rise of the 'handshake' motif in the late fifth century BCE.

In connection with the marginalization of private ritual and the development of written and civic alternatives to lament, a new era of memorialization begins in the classical period – the blossoming of tragedy, the funeral oration, and the public funerary monument or casualty list[2]; though privileging of oral communication persists[3], writing becomes less ambiguous and the familial lament exists side by side with and often in subordination to civic forms of memorialization. In this chapter, I will discuss the trajectories of lament and the epigram in the classical period and their evolving significance for later audiences.[4] I will explore the further development of both orally performed (threnoi, funeral oration, tragedy) and written media (literary epigrams, classical funerary monuments) in light of the readings above: How do traditional tensions between various media persist or evolve? How does each medium establish its own generic authority or contest the authority of the others? What relative values does each medium place on oral, written, and material memorials? In order to provide the greatest possible continuity with my discussions of Homeric lament and the archaic epigram, I have chosen exemplary texts that focus on the deaths of warriors where possible, including Simonides' epigram on Megistias, Sophocles' *Antigone*'s treatment of Eteocles and Polyneices, and the epitaphios logos in the following chapter. These final readings will show how literacy and the diversification of commemorative genres continues to influence the classical ideas of mourning, from tragedy as a civic representation of lament to the rise of the public monument and the funeral oration. While many thematic concerns persist (e.g. the beautiful death, the ideal of activity in response to death, death as an activity in itself), new concerns arise regarding the context of the death and mourning of the individual within the collective context: these include attention to the ambiguities of traditional models of the warrior's death as well as an inquiry into the nature of the afterlife and into the potential conflicts between individual and civic memorialization. By tracing the increasing

---

[2] On Athenian public burials, see Clairmont, *Patrios Nomos* passim.

[3] For the persistent classical privileging of the oral over the monumental (i.e. written), see Raymond Descat, 'Autour d'une fonction sociale de l'oralité: travail, échange et parole chez Pindare,' *Oralita: Cultura, Letteratura, Discorso* ed. Bruno Gentili and Giuseppe Paioni (Rome, 1985): 69-80 and Steiner passim.

[4] R. Heinze, 'Von altgriechischen Kriegergräbern,' *Neue Jahrbücher* 35 (1915): 1-7, esp. 2 on the literary autonomy of the funeral epigram from its position in situ starting in the archaic and early classical period, as seen for example in Herodotus' citation of funerary epigrams and in Simonides' literary epitaphs. The focus of later and literary epigrams on the creation of personae may well reflect the early centrality of personae for the genre on stone.

division between individual and civic memorialization in the different media available to the mourner in the classical period, I intend to provide the basis for a new reading of the classical funeral oration, which represents one response to these various genres of mourning and their continued problematization of lament and the warrior's death.

3.1 *The Pindaric Threnos*

The Pindaric threnoi provide an example of fifth-century, professionally composed laments; the extant fragments of the threnoi are most likely not a representative sample of contemporary lament, in that their sources are often later authors with particularly religious or philosophical interests, such as Plutarch and Plato.[5] Nonetheless, the fragmentary threnoi display significant continuities with the Homeric laments and archaic epigram as well as dialogue with other poetic genres; this interaction with other poetic genres is thematic and generally independent of shared traditional diction. As I will show below, the threnoi establish their authority as an orally performed genre in parallel with other types of songs for and about the living; by subverting traditional oppositions between life and death, the threnos characterizes lament as an act of reciprocity and a continuation of shared τέρψις between living and dead communities over the barrier of mortality. This authoritative strategy reveals the ongoing agon between lament and other types of songs for and about the living, as well as the persistence of both oral and written genres of memory in the culture of oralcy.

By contrast to the Homeric characterization of lament as the inverse of epic and the epigram's superficial treatment of mourning, the most remarkable feature of the Pindaric threnos is its self-assertion as a genre related to other performance genres, but legitimate in its own right:

> Ἔντι μὲν χρυσαλακάτου τεκέων Λατοῦς ἀοιδαί
>
> ὥ[ρ]ιαι παιάνιδες. ἔντι [δὲ] καὶ
> θάλλοντος ἐκ κισσοῦ στέφανον {ἐκ} Διο[νύ]σου
> ο[βρομι⟨ ⟩? παιόμεναι. †τὸ δὲ κοιμίσαν†
> τρεῖς [ ] Καλλιόπας, ὡς οἱ σταθῇ μνάμα⟨τ'⟩ ἀποφθιμένων
> ἁ μὲν εὐχαίταν Λίνον αἴλινον ὕμνει,
> ἁ δ' Ὑμέναιον, ⟨ὃν⟩ ἐν γάμοισι χροϊζόμενον

[5] Humphreys 125n10.

..κτ.σύμπρωτον λάβεν ἔσχατος ὕμνων.
ἁ δὲ ⟨ ⟩ Ἰάλεμον ὠμοβόλῳ
νούσῳ {ὅτι} πεδαθέντα σθένος.
υἱὸν Οἰάγρου ⟨δὲ⟩
Ὀρφέα χρυσάορα (fr. 128c)

Here, the three modes of poetry (τρεῖς... Καλλιόπας, 5) that memorialize the dead are the lament for the cult hero, the wedding song, and the lament for the dead, represented by the emblematic figures Linus[6], Hymenaeus[7], and Ialemus[8]; these are set on a par with Apollo and Dionysus, who embody the paian and the dithyramb respectively.

While Pindar contrasts the paian and dithyramb as different types of songs employed among the living, he sets them both in opposition to the third element in the series, the songs of death.[9] In a typically Pindaric triad structure, τὸ δέ (4) signals the opposition between the first pair of genres (themselves in opposition: ἔντι μὲν... ἔντι [δέ], 128c.1-2) and the genres of lament that follow[10], a strategy that implies the comparability rather than the usual subordination of lament to other performance genres.

The central connection between the different subgenres of lament is their origin in the mourning of the Muses for their sons Linus, Hymenaeus, and Ialemus[11] – the etymology of the lament for the dead

---

[6] On the Linus-song, see Hom. *Il.* 18.570 (Achilles' shield), Hdt. 2.79 (Egyptians' tradition of Linus-song), and Sappho 140b (Paus. on Sappho's songs celebrating Oitolinos and Adonis together), as well as R. Häussler, 'λίνος ante Λίνον?' *RhM* 142 (1974): 1-14, who discusses the simultaneously joyful and mournful aspects of the genre with reference to the question of the precedence of Linus as character or the Linus-song as genre. Also F. W. Schneidewin, 'Über ein neuentdecktes Bruchstück eines Pindarischen Threnos,' *RhM* 2 (1834): 110-121, esp. 115 on the figure of Linus.

[7] The hymenaion is the wedding song accompanying the transition of the bride from her parents' to her husband's house; it probably included a makarismos and, like the Linus-song, involved a mixture of joyful and mournful song for Hymenaeus who dies or disappears on his wedding day (see Rehm 14, Schneidewin 116-8). On the hymenaion, see also R. Muth, '"Hymenaios" und "Epithalamion,"' *WS* 67 (1954): 5-45, who discusses alternate explanations of the origin of the term 'hymenaios,' the evidence for the performance of the hymenaion, and the association of the genre with the figure Hymenaios (5-36).

[8] Elsewhere in the threnoi, Pindar designates the threnos with the term Ialemos: ὄ]ρθιον ἰάλεμ[ον] / κελαδῆσαι (fr. 128c.a2-3). Perhaps we are to see some connection between the paianic songs of the first lines and the lament, as Ialemos is said to be the son of Apollo and Kalliope in the Pindaric corpus: τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Καλλιοπῆς ὡς φησὶ Πίνδαρος (Schol. Eur. *Rhesus* 895).

[9] Maria Cannata Ferra, 'Peani, Ditirambi, Treni in Pind. Fr. 128c S.-M.,' *GIF* N. S. 32 (1980): 182.

[10] Ferra 182 n. 10, 183: cf. *Ol.* 1.1ff., with contrasts between an initial pair and a third item which Pindar further thematizes.

[11] Ferra 183.

hero, the mournful songs of a wedding[12], and the funeral lament proper. This personification of the genres of funerary song also serves as an exemplum, in which the Muses' suffering functions as a consolatory model for the human experience of mortality; the final mention of Orpheus perhaps alludes to that singer's position as the prototypical son mourned by the Muses, yet also as the first poet whose performance transcends the boundaries of death and so perhaps serves as a model for this threnos.[13] The traditional independence of Orpheus both as a figure mediating between various functions (hunting and music, misogynist and uxorious husband of Eurydice) and as a disembodied singing head are emblematic of the general independence of the verbal and musical arts, perhaps even beyond death, an attribute of Orpheus which could reinforce Pindar's portrayal of the threnos as an independent and authoritative performance genre.[14] Although it remains unclear how the connection between these poetic figures functions within the larger trajectory of the threnos, the significance of this fragment lies in Pindar's assertion of the specific generic identity of the threnos and other genres memorializing the dead, and the placement of these genres on the same level as the generic traditions of the paian and dithyramb. It is from this newly independent standpoint that the threnos engages with conventions of the Homeric lament, the epigram, and other genres while maintaining its generic function of reflecting the passage of the deceased from the community of the living to that of the dead.

The threnoi share, develop, and challenge various features of the Homeric γόοι; while Pindar may not engage directly with the texts of the Homeric γόοι as we have them, he carries on a dialogue with the traditional lament motifs we find in the γόοι, which are our only available source for the themes of oral lament until this time period. Several linguistic features of the Homeric γόοι and other laments resurface in the Pindaric threnos – λείπειν of the departure constituted by death[15], the mourner as παθοῦσα[16],

[12] On the motif of parallels drawn between wedding and funeral song and rituals, see Ferra 185-6, Rehm 29-41. Cf. the Phrasikleia epigram's thematization of death as marriage: ἀντὶ γάμο | παρὰ θεον τοῦτο | λαχοσ' ὄνομα (CEG 24.2).

[13] Ferra 187-8.

[14] On the Indo-European roots of Orpheus as a mediating figure whose decapitated head remains mobile and communicative after death and thus encorporates the independence of the verbal and musical arts, see Joseph F. Nagy, 'Hierarchy, Heroes, and Heads: Indo-European Structures in Greek Myth,' in Lowell Edmunds, ed., *Approaches to Greek Myth* (Baltimore, 1990): 199-238, esp. 209-220.

[15] Fr. 128d18, 131b2, 133.5, cf. *Il.* 19.288 (Briseis on Patroclus' death as departure).

[16] αἰνοπα[θ 128e.c3; cf. Hecabe's αἰνὰ παθοῦσα (*Il.* 22.431) and Penelope's μὲ μάλ' αἰνοπαθῆ (*Od.* 18.201).

and perhaps line-initial νῦν δέ.[17] Various motifs also persist, such as genealogical themes[18], chronological motifs, and the juxtaposition of opposites. Designations such as γλυ[κ]υπικ (i.e. γλυκύπικρον, 128b7) have resonances with the juxtaposition of opposites in the Homeric γόοι, such as δυσαριστοτόκεια (*Il.* 18.54 [Thetis]). The oppositions and chronological contrasts characteristic of the γόοι are joined by a new concept of contrast of beginning and end, rooted in new attention to the afterlife, but also very likely referring to elegiac sentiments regarding the importance of the end of various processes for their whole[19]:

> ὄλβιος ὅστις ἰδὼν κεῖν' εἶσ' ὑπὸ χθόν'.
> οἶδε μὲν βίου τελευτάν,
> οἶδεν δὲ διόσδοτον ἀρχάν. (fr. 137).

Elsewhere in Pindaric poetry, τελευτά marks a completion or an outcome, including the end of life, which allows the assessment of the nature of life as a whole. A positive τελευτά includes the attainment of old age with children, the persistence of good fortune, or a good reputation after death[20]; yet here the τελευτά of life is viewed not only in relation to the living, but also in relation to the deceased, whose death marks the beginning of a new existence in the afterlife.

As we have seen above, lament and epigram treat the end of life as a definitive moment of change; the γόοι are replete with chronological transitions and the epigrams focus on the stable identity of the deceased to the exclusion of the transitions of death and mourning. By contrast, the threnos treats life (βίου τελευτάν) and death or reincarnation (διόσδοτον ἀρχάν) as analogical and integral wholes bounded less by a liminal period of transition than by a change in existence embodied by the onset of the afterlife or reincarnation, itself associated with the positive gift of the god (διόσδοτον). Similarly, the traditional reference to chronological cycles is transformed into a dialogue with the analogy between day : night and life : death, in which the imagination of light in the afterlife displaces the trope of death as departure from the light of the sun[21]:

---

[17] Fr. 128b5, cf. *Il.* 19.289 (Briseis), 24.757 (Hecabe).

[18] e.g. τοκεῦσιν...]ν γένος 128d17; cf. the allusion to the parentage of Ialemos from Apollo and Kalliope, 128c.

[19] e.g. Solon 13.15-7, Theogn. 201, 607-610 , 1075-8.

[20] Attainment of old age with children: *Ol.* 5.22-3; persistence of good fortune: *Ol.* 7.25-6, *Nem.* 11.16, *Isthm.* 7.47-8; good reputation after death: *Ol.* 7.68, *Pyth.* 12.29.

[21] The Homeric association of light with life and activity and death with darkness and departure from light is reversed here, in that the afterlife offers light in the form of further existence in the underworld (frs. 129-131) and of rebirth (fr. 133.2-5); see D. Bremer, *Licht und Dunkel in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Bonn, 1976) 244 with n. 35, 265.

τοῖσι λάμπει μὲν μένος ἀελίου
τὰν ἐνθάδε νύκτα κάτω
φοινικορόδοις ⟨δ'⟩ ἐνὶ λειμώνεσσι... (129.1-3 SM)

While the threnoi obscure the distinction between life and death, the transition from one state to the other likewise admits increasing ambiguity; Pindar draws on elegiac motifs by deconstructing the usually stark contrast between life and death (e.g. Mimnermus 1) and treating aging as a liminal phase between life and death:

σῶμα μὲν πάντων ἕπεται θανάτῳ περισθενεῖ,
ζωὸν δ' ἔτι λείπεται αἰῶνος εἴδωλον. τὸ γάρ ἐστι μόνον
ἐκ θεῶν. εὕδει δὲ πρασσόντων μελέων, ἀτὰρ εὑδόντεσσιν ἐν πολλοῖς ὀνείροις
δείκνυσι τερπνῶν ἐφέρποισαν χαλεπῶν τε κρίσιν (fr. 131 b).

The opposition between former life and the departure embodied by death, marked in the γόοι with line-initial ζωός and λείπειν[22], is now made ambiguous in that life is in the process of departure while the individual is still alive: ζωὸν δ' ἔτι λείπεται αἰῶνος εἴδωλον (131.2). Likewise, the portrayal of aging (εὕδει δὲ πρασσόντων μελέων 3) fuses the traditional question of the active death and response to death with the traditional motif of aging as an initial stage of dying[23]: where does the liminal period of aging begin, and where does life end and death begin? This threnos also draws on the elegiac contrast of death and death ritual with τέρψις, and redefines death as resolving life's pleasures: τερπνῶν ἐφέρποισαν χαλεπῶν τε κρίσιν (4).

In addition, the Pindaric threnos reconfigures τέρψις as part of the deceased's underworld existence, which parallels many of the activities associated with idealized life in Homer and with sympotic activity in elegy:

φοινικορόδοις ⟨δ'⟩ ἐνὶ λειμώνεσσι προάστιον αὐτῶν
καὶ λιβάνων σκιαρᾶν
καὶ χρυσοκάρποισιν βέβριθε ⟨δενδρέοις⟩

---

[22] e.g. *ζωὸν μέν σε ἔλειπον* (*Il.* 19.288 [Briseis]); μέγα κῦδος ἔησθα / *ζωὸς* ἐών. νῦν αὖ θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κιχάνει (22.436 [Hecabe]); αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ στυγερῷ ἐνὶ πένθει *λείπεις* (22.483 [Andromache]), κὰδ δὲ μὲ χήρην / *λείπεις* ἐν μεγάροισι (24.725-6 [Andromache]), ἦ μέν μοι *ζωός* περ ἐὼν φίλος ἦσθα θεοῖσιν (24.749 [Hecabe]).

[23] See Thomas Falkner, *The Poetics of Old Age in Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy* (Norman, OK, 1995) passim on the various positive and negative portayals of aging in the Greek poetic tradition; see especially 28-31 on the Homeric perception of age as the liminal period between life and death (the 'threshhold' of age, the position of old men on the city wall in wartime).

καὶ τοὶ μὲν ἵπποις γυμνασίοισι ⟨τε—⟩
 τοὶ δὲ πεσσοῖς
τοὶ δὲ φορμίγγεσσι τέρπονται, παρὰ δέ σφισιν
 εὐανθὴς τέθαλεν ὄλβος.
ὀδμὰ δ' ἐρατὸν κατὰ χῶρον κίδναται
† αἰεί . . θύματα μειγνύντων πυρὶ τηλεφανεῖ
⟨παντοῖα θεῶν ἐπὶ βωμοῖς⟩ (fr. 129.3-10)

Here, the threnos describes the afterlife with appropriated epic and elegiac imagery of luxury (presence of the φόρμιγξ[24], pleasant odors[25]) as well as terminology of pleasure, fullness, and good fortune: τέρπεσθαι, βρίθειν (3)[26], εὐανθής (7)[27], θάλλειν (7)[28], ἐρατός (8).[29] The predominance of vocabulary of abundance, fertility, and musical communication marks the underworld as a place of continued social activity and exchange analogical to the interaction among the living. By contrast with the Homeric laments, the Pindaric threnos, like the grave epigram, focuses on the stable identities of the mourner and the deceased; while the Homeric γόος and katabasis accounts remain distinct and few themes of the afterlife appear in the earliest funerary epigrams, the threnos displays a new concern with underworld existence during the lament for the dead. In the threnoi, the underworld is described as a meadow (λειμώνεσσι, 129.3[30]) or

---

[24] The φόρμιγξ is associated with the activities of the living, including the song for the victor (*Ol.* 3.8, 9.13, *Nem.* 9.8) and collective priorities such as χάρις and stability of the group (*Pyth.* 2.71, 4.296); its music and the lyrics set to it are viewed as the recompense for action or as the generators of memory (*Nem.* 4.5, *Isthm.* 5.27).

[25] Usually associated with the superhuman (Hom. *Od.* 5.59-60 [Kalypso], Theogn. 9 [Delos]) and with elements of the symposium (Hom. *Od.* 9.210 of wine, Xenophanes B1.7 of incense).

[26] βρίθειν is typically used of natural abundance: Hes. *WD* 234 (wool), 466 (grain), Hom. *Il.* 8.307 (poppy), 16.384-5 (earth during a rainstorm), 18.561 (vineyard), *Od.* 9.219 (cheeses), 15.333-4 (full tables), 19.112 (fruit trees); elsewhere, Pindar uses the term metaphorically, of εὐδοξία (*Nem.* 3.40).

[27] Used of female ancestors (*Ol.* 6.84), the activity of the poet (*Pyth.* 2.62), ὄλβος (*Isthm.* 5.12), youth (*Isthm.* 7.34), and a crown (*Isthm.* 7.51).

[28] In the Pindaric corpus, θάλλειν and related terms designate heroes (*Ol.* 2.45, 6.68, *Nem.* 10.53), abundance (*Ol.* 9.16), beauty / fertility / thriving (*Nem.* 1.71, 4.88, *Isthm.* 7.49), and good fortune or fortunate people (*Pyth.* 4.65, 7.21, *Nem.* 10.42, *Isthm.* 3/4.6, 22). Cf. *Il.* 22.496, where Andromache laments the coming expulsion of her orphaned son from the banquet of his father's friends: ἀμφιθαλὴς ἐκ δαίτυος.

[29] Elsewhere in Pindar, ἐρατός refers to light (*Ol.* 10.75, cf. Theogn. 569), youth (*Ol.* 10.99, cf. Theogn. 1131, 1348), song (fr. 124a-b.1, 140b), the athletic contest or victory (*Nem.* 6.12, *Isthm.* 2.31), and fertility in birth (*Ol.* 6.43) and sexual union (*Pyth.* 9.12, *Isthm.* 8.44, cf. Hes. *Th.* 970, 1009, 1018, Hom. *Il.* 3.64, Solon 25.1). One particularly interesting parallel is Tyrtaeus' characterization of the dying warrior as ἐρατός for women (fr. 10.28-9).

[30] For the underworld as meadow, see *Od.* 11.539, 573, 24.13; cf. also *Od.* 12.39-54 on the Sirens, whose deadly domain is a meadow (θέλγουσιν ἀοιδῇ, / ἥμεναι ἐν λειμῶνι, 44-5).

a dark place with rivers: ἔνθεν τὸν ἄπειρον ἐρεύγονται σκότον / βληχροὶ δνοφερᾶς νυκτὸς ποταμοί (fr. 130); while borrowing from Homeric geography of the underworld, the threnos also fuses it with imagery of τέρψις and pleasure which traditionally belong to the realm of the living: τοῖσι λάμπει μὲν μένος τἀελίου /τὰν ἐνθάδε νύκτα κάτω (fr. 129.1-2). While it is not always possible to say from their fragmentary nature how these scenes might be evaluated by the audience in context, it remains significant that the threnoi call into question both the τέρψις- lament opposition and the traditional separation between lament and katabasis narrative in their characterization of death.

In particular, the threnoi emphasize ὄλβος, the well-being of the afterlife, and the particular fate of the initiate in the afterlife:

> εὐανθὴς τέθαλεν ὄλβος (fr. 129.7)
> ὄλβιοι δ' ἅπαντες αἴσᾳ λυσιπόνων τελετᾶν (fr. 131a)
> εὐδαιμόνων δραπέτας οὐκ ἔστιν ὄλβος (fr. 134)
> ὄλβιος ὅστις ἰδὼν κεῖν' εἶσ' ὑπὸ χθόν' (fr. 137.1)

ὄλβος is god-given good fortune[31] which rewards labors and functions as a release from hardships[32]; while it can pass through various generations (*Pyth.* 5.55), it can also inspire φθόνος (*Pyth.* 11.29) and is unstable, depending on the action or mentality of its recipient[33] or simply the passage of time.[34] In the Pindaric corpus, ὄλβιος is used of people who have a good (poetic) reputation[35], suggesting that the lament functions as a bridge between the deceased's existence among the stable dead and the audience in the poetic context. As portrayed by the threnos, the deceased's well-being in the afterlife parallels the good reputation he or she enjoys among the living through the lament's poetic undertaking. The initiates who enjoy continued existence after death take on a new designation as heroes, a renaming that alludes to an interrelationship of the deceased's stable identity, his κλέος among the living and the threnos that links the two: ἐς δὲ τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ἥροες ἁγνοὶ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων καλέονται (fr. 133.5).

The use of heroic language in the threnoi reveals a long-term trend away from the Homeric vision of lament as the end of the generation of

---

[31] *Ol.* 2.22, 36, 6.72, *Nem.* 8.17, 9.45, *Isthm.* 6.12, fr. 52f.133, 52k.9.
[32] *Ol.* 2.22, *Pyth.* 1.46, 12.28.
[33] *Ol.* 1.56, 5.23, *Pyth.* 2.26, 5.14, 11.53, *Nem.* 11.13, *Isthm.* 3/4.5.
[34] *Ol.* 6.97, *Pyth.* 1.46, 3.89, 105, *Nem.* 7.58.
[35] Of people: *Ol.* 7.10 φᾶμαι... ἀγαθαί, *Pyth.* 1.65 κλέος ἄνθησεν, *Pyth.* 9.1-4 Ἐθέλω... γεγωνεῖν / ὄλβιον ἄνδρα.

an individual reputation; beginning with the archaic epigrams, the dead is portrayed in heroic language and language of praise, while the fifth century brings about characterization of the deceased in terms formerly reserved for the heroes, including such motifs as enjoyment in the afterlife and ὄλβος.[36] Fr. 133 represents a conception of the afterlife disconnected from the traditional poetic imagery of the underworld and perhaps drawing on Empedoclean, Pythagorean, Orphic, or Dionysiac philosophy[37]:

> οἷσι δὲ Φερσεφόνα ποινὰν παλαιοῦ πένθεος
> δέξεται, ἐς τὸν ὕπερθεν ἅλιον κείνων ἐνάτῳ ἔτεϊ
> ἀνδιδοῖ ψυχὰς πάλιν, ἐκ τᾶν βασιλῆες ἀγαυοί
> καὶ σθένει κραιπνοὶ σοφίᾳ τε μέγιστοι
> ἄνδρες αὔξοντ'. ἐς δὲ τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ἥροες ἁγνοὶ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων καλέονται.

Although the fragment refers to initiation, the image of death here remains analogous to those above: continued exchange in the afterlife as among the community of the living (ποινὰν, 1; ἀνδιδοῖ 3), the attainment of heroic status or reincarnation (2-5), and a continued reputation among the living even after death (καλέονται, 5).

The threnoi depart from the other genres we have examined in that they incorporate explicitly religious elements, examine the nature of the afterlife, and even inquire into the role of divinities in death and the afterlife. By comparison, the γόοι either mention the gods in positive contexts (e.g. Hecabe's gratitude for the preservation of Hector's corpse *Il.* 24.749-750), as symbolic of natural forces (e.g. Apollo as bringer of death *Il.* 24.758-9) or in contexts explaining the gods' distribution of different fates: πέρι γάρ μοι 'Ολύμπιος ἄλγε' ἔδωκεν (*Od.* 4.722[38]). Similarly, the grave epigrams treat the gods as impersonal forces of fate (παρὰ θεὸν τοῦτο | λαχὸσ' ὄνομα, CEG 24) or in metonymic functions (Ares as war, CEG 27.2, 145.2). By contrast, the threnoi encompass a wide range of references to religious activities and concepts: the belief in reincarnation (133.1-3) and ὄλβος as divine recompense, and the use of the iunx (128b.8) and initiatory rites:

---

[36] Cf. the Persian War epigrams C.2: τοῖσιμ πανθαλὲς ὄλβος ἐπιστρέ| [φεται].

[37] Hugh Lloyd-Jones, 'Pindar and the After-life,' *Entretiens Hardt* 31 (1985): 259-260, cf. Günther Zuntz, *Persephone: Three Essays on Religion and Thought in Magna Graecia* (Oxford, 1971) 277ff. on the Orphic / Dionysiac / Pythagorean lamellae of the fourth and third centuries BCE, with various parallels to the threnoi: references to the dead as ὄλβιος (A1.3, A2.3, A3.3), the interchange of the deceased with Persephone (A1.1, 7, A2.1, 6, A3.1, 6) or other underworld figures (B1, B2), the payment of recompense (ποινά) (A2.4, A3.4), and the description of the underworld as a meadow (A4.6).

[38] Cf. ἀλλ' οὐ Ζεὺς ἄνδρεσσι νοήματα πάντα τελευτᾷ. (*Il.* 18.328, labelled βαρὺ στενάχων μετεφωνέε, 323 [Achilles mourns for Patroclus])

Πίνδαρος περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι μυστηρίων λέγων ἐπιφέρει·
ὄλβιος ὅστις ἰδὼν κεῖν' εἶσ' ὑπὸ χθόν'.
οἶδε μὲν βίου τελευτάν,
οἶδεν δὲ διόσδοτον ἀρχάν. (fr. 137).

ὄλβιοι δ' ἅπαντες αἴσᾳ λυσιπόνων τελετᾶν (131a).

The threnoi also feature a broader population of gods, including lesser divinities and mythic figures: Leto (128c.1), Kalliope (128c.5), Ino (128d.2), the Nereids (?128d.5), Leucothea (?128e.c7), Kastor (?128f.5), and Kaineus (128f.7). As seen in fr. 128c in particular, the threnoi depict these gods in metonymic contexts (Apollo as the paian, Dionysus as the dithyramb) and as mythic exempla (the mourning Muses); yet the gods of the threnoi also serve as positive agents in the afterlife existence of the dead: Persephone receives recompense from the initiate, insuring reincarnation in a nine-year cycle (fr. 133) and the afterlife or reincarnation originates from Zeus (διόσδοτον ἀρχάν, fr. 137.3). Similarly, the gradual onset of death through the sleepy old age of the living (ζωὸν δ' ἔτι λείπεται αἰῶνος εἴδωλον. τὸ γάρ ἐστι μόνον ἐκ θεῶν, fr.131b3) and the characterization of the deceased as ὄλβιος associate the nature of dying and the afterlife with divine benevolence; just as human activity continues in the afterlife, the initiates' exchange with these gods persists following death: διόσδοτον ἀρχάν (fr. 137.3), Φερσεφόνα ποινὰν παλαιοῦ πένθεος δέξεται... ἀνδιδοῖ ψυχὰς πάλιν (fr. 133.2-3). While the individual dead lacks prominence in the threnos, the reference to general patterns of human destiny and belief bridges individual and collective priorities by addressing religious themes relevant to each individual (mortality, the significance of life) and to the audience collectively (common religious belief and practice, divine and human exempla).

The Pindaric threnoi represent the reaction of the professional threnos to the traditional characterization of lament. In the Homeric poems and in elegy, lament in general is subordinated to the genres that represent them, creating a topos in which lament is rejected in favor of martial, sympotic, and other activities of the living; here, the professional lament asserts its generic autonomy by characterizing itself through the paradigm of private laments of the Muses for their sons[39] and by legitimizing lament as parallel to other poetic genres performed among the living community. Much like the Homeric laments, the threnos continues to develop themes

[39] cf. the performance of the threnos for Achilles by the Muses at *Od.* 24.60-1 – perhaps a traditional association of the genre with the muses?

of chronological passage, but also evaluates them critically, collapsing sharp distinctions between life and death by treating age as a prelude to death or examining life and afterlife as integral and even analogical wholes. The mourning of death becomes neither a crisis to be bridged as in the γόοι nor a focus on the stable products of transition as in the epigram, but an examination of the analogous existence of the survivors among the living and the dead in the afterlife. The exchange of song among the survivors parallels the interchange among the community of the dead, who enjoy continued memory through songs of the living as well as analogous exchange with the mortal and divine inhabitants of the afterlife.

As an orally performed genre, the Pindaric threnoi display many thematic attributes we have seen in the Homeric representation of lament. The threnos describes the genres of lament as establishing μνάμα⟨τ'⟩ ἀποφθιμένων (fr. 128.5), associating them with traditionally transmitted song and symbols[40] and perhaps even with the labeling of stelai as μνήματα. Thus, despite their written composition and their possible agonistic stance toward the inscribed stele, Pindar's threnoi continue to identify themselves as a definitively oral genre in performance: ὄ]ρθιον ἰάλεμ[ον] / κελαδήσατ (fr. 128e.a2-3, cf. πολλοῖς ἀκ[ο]ῦσαι fr. 128d.13). Other than this single possible reference to the grave monument (μνάμα⟨τ'⟩ ἀποφθιμένων fr. 128.5), the extant threnoi eschew all apparent reference to death ritual and the gravesite, instead representing themselves as a genre on a par with other poetic performances among the living. While it is impossible to argue *ex silentio* or solely on the basis of the reference to their own song as μνήματα that the threnoi privilege the orally performed lament over other forms of memorialization, the abstract characterization of the threnos suggests the wholly oral identification of the genre despite its complex and apparently written composition. While the forms of lament are personified as the Muses' sons, they are otherwise never portrayed in material metaphors as other Pindaric genres (e.g. the dithyramb, as θάλλοντος ἐκ κισσοῦ στέφανον 128c.3) and thus evade any terms of comparison with material memorialization. The threnos generates memory less through the commemoration of the individual deceased, who is never explicitly named, than through the paralleling of communities of the living and the deceased – the common experience of mortality, the

---

40 Elsewhere in the Pindaric corpus, μνῆμα designates λόγοι or songs that memorialize an event (e.g. the athletic contest *Pyth.* 5.49, *Isthm.* 8.62) or traditional material symbols of an event (*Ol.* 3.15 on the olive crown as a symbolic μνῆμα of a contest).

analogical life and afterlife existence, and the mutual relevance of song. This analogical existence of living and dead groups makes the threnoi into universally relevant accounts of each individual's experience of mortality, while also suggesting a continual interchange of similar sentiments between living and dead members of the same group over time.[41]

3.2 *Perspectives on Thermopylae: Simonides' Epigram on Megistias (Hdt. 7.228)*

The Herodotean histories offer evidence for the place of the inscribed object in the classical culture of oralcy. The position of writing in Herodotus is ambiguous: it supplements existing forms of material signification such as tokens or monuments and can take on their ambiguity or extend their force accordingly. Writing is often associated with eastern tyranny, which commemorates and establishes power by written dictates of individual leaders[42]; by contrast, Greek society is characterized by oral exchange and monuments commemorating collective efforts.[43] For Herodotus, the inscribed grave monument reflects the polysemy of writing, a view not unlike the ambiguous Homeric portrayal of the uninscribed σῆμα. The monuments of eastern rulers unwittingly reflect and even ridicule their despotism, while writing on tombs is shown to be misleading, or potentially misleading.[44] Yet the ambiguity of writing attaches itself not only to the barbarian tomb, but also to Greek gravesites such as the tombs at Plataea, which accurately reflect each state's social structure, yet are accompanied by fake graves added later (9.85). The ambiguity of the eastern monument is often countered by oral transmission, as in the Egyptians' silence about Cheops' and Chephren's names and their authorship of their own monuments (2.128) – by contrast, Greek oral and inscribed memory confirm and reinforce each other[45], as we shall see

---

[41] Cf. Leslie Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991). 62-70, 82. Kurke discusses the frequent association of the epinician's victory celebration with terms of funeral and birth; the praise for the living victor extends his οἶκος into the past and 'reawakens' it (*Ol.* 8.74-84, *Pyth.* 9.103-5), making the immediate victory a part of the family's continuing life cycle.

[42] For eastern commemoration in writing, see Herodotus on Darius' monuments (4.87.1, 88.2, 90-1). For written dictates, see Herodotus on the inscribed stelai of Sesostris 2.102.4-5 and the written dictates of Deioces 1.96.1ff..

[43] e.g. 5.77.4 (inscription at the Propylaia on the Acropolis); see Steiner 5-7, 127-142.

[44] Steiner 136ff. See the trivializing record of the laborers' food consumption during the construction of Cheops' monument (Hdt. 2.125.6), the trick tomb of Nitocris (Hdt. 1.187), and the inscription of Asychis which omits its author (Hdt. 2.136.3-4), respectively.

[45] Steiner 139.

below in Herodotus' citation of the monuments at Thermopylae. In contrast to the inscribed grave and its polysemy, the action of mourning out loud functions as a readable sign marking a significant relationship or sympathy with the dead (e.g. 1.109.2). Nonetheless, private mourning is seen as oriented toward kinship concerns and therefore at odds with the state: individual mourning is viewed as revealing the mourner's potentially subversive personal interests[46], while the civic burial and the hero cult are almost exclusively Greek[47] and represent the definitive aspect of the polis. Thus, in the Herodotean history, the various forms of lament and inscribed memorial display social and semantic ambiguities, respectively.

In what follows, I will examine Herodotus' account of Simonides' epigram for Megistias and the other epigrams at Thermopylae (7.228) to inquire into the relationship between the Thermopylae epigrams and the traditions of lament and epigram, the spectrum of individual and collective memorials for the same event, the changing position of the written memorial, and finally the features of these monuments that reflect general trends in the memorials of the classical period. In Herodotus' narrative, the coexistence of oral and written sources reveals the assimilation between verbal and material genres of memory as concomitant products of both individual and collective mourning; yet, conversely, the opposition between individual expression and collective commemoration becomes increasingly important as both oral and written memorials are adopted and controlled by the polis, especially in the collective undertaking of war.

Any discussion of the Simonidean epigrams is rendered problematic by questions of authorship; beyond authorship, the dates, textual integrity, and literary or inscriptional context of the 'Simonidean' epigrams remain open.[48] The sole epigram which most scholars recognize as genuinely

---

[46] Hdt. 1.111.2 (mourning in Harpagos' house for the infant Cyrus as he is about to be exposed), 2.121g (Rhampsinitos hangs out the body of a thief in order to discover his identity through the mourning of his relatives), 3.14 (Cambyses sends out Egyptian children dressed as slaves to test whether Psamennitus will mourn), 3.64-6 (Cambyses mourns for Smerdis).

[47] hero and grave cult: Hdt. 1.68 (Orestes), 4.34 (grave cult of Hyperborean girls at Delos), 5.47 (hero cult at the grave of the Olympic victor Philippos in Egesta), 9.116.1-2 (Protesilaus cult at the gravesite); civic burial: Hdt. 3.55 (public funeral of the Samians); though see Hdt. 7.117 of a Persian civic burial.

[48] The critical approach to Simonidean authorship begins with A. A. Junghahn, 'De Simonidis Cei epigrammatis quaestiones,' *Vierter Jahresbericht über das Luisenstädtische Gymnasium in Berlin* (1869): 3-41. Various scholars have attempted to develop a paradigm for distinguishing 'genuine' from spurious epigrams (A. Hauvette, *De l'authenticité des épigrammes de Simonide* (Paris, 1896)), yet this project has remained far from definitive in its results (see John H. Molyneux, *Simonides: A Historical Study* (Wauconda, IL, 1992) 4-17).

Simonidean is 6 Page (Hdt. 7.228); this passage is the single fifth-century attribution of an epigram to Simonides in a context that suggests the highest possibility of a trustworthy attribution.[49] For the purposes of acknowledging this scholarly quandary regarding authorship and for the purposes of considering Simonides' individual composition of a private epigram for Megistias within the context of collective commemoration at Thermopylae, I am focusing my discussion on Simonides 6 P within the context of Hdt. 7.228:

> θαφθεῖσι δέ σφι αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ τῇ περ ἔπεσον καὶ τοῖσι πρότερον τελευτήσασι ἢ ⟨τοὺς⟩ ὑπὸ Λεωνίδεω ἀποπεμφθέντας οἰχέσθαι, ἐπιγέγραπται γράμματα λέγοντα τάδε·
>
> μυριάσιν ποτὲ τῇδε τριηκοσίαις ἐμάχοντο
> ἐκ Πελοποννάσου χιλιάδες τέτορες. (22a P)
>
> ταῦτα μὲν δὴ τοῖσι πᾶσι ἐπιγέγραπται, τοῖσι δὲ Σπαρτιήτῃσι ἰδίῃ·
>
> ὦ ξεῖν' ἀγγέλλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῇδε
> κείμεθα τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι. (22b P)
>
> Λακεδαιμονίοισι μὲν δὴ τοῦτο, τῷδε δὲ μάντι τόδε·
>
> μνῆμα τόδε κλεινοῖο Μεγιστία, ὅν ποτε Μῆδοι
> Σπερχειὸν ποταμὸν κτεῖναν ἀμειψάμενοι,
> μάντιος, ὃς τότε Κῆρας ἐπερχομένας σάφα εἰδὼς
> οὐκ ἔτλη Σπάρτης ἡγεμόνας προλιπεῖν. (6 P)
>
> ἐπιγράμμασι μέν νυν καὶ στήλῃσι, ἔξω ἢ τὸ τοῦ μάντιος ἐπίγραμμα, Ἀμφικτύονες εἰσί σφεας οἱ ἐπικοσμήσαντες. τὸ δὲ τοῦ μάντιος Μεγιστίεω Σιμονίδης ὁ Λεωπρέπεός ἐστι κατὰ ξενίην ὁ ἐπιγράψας.

The demarcation of an oral, written, or inscribed text with the name of the author is uncommon in the archaic and classical periods; yet, perhaps in parallel to the introduction of his history with his own name, Herodotus draws on oral tradition to connect Megistias' epitaph with Simonides, a type of attribution which does not occur again until much later.[50] Herodotus never directly attributes authorship of the Megistias epigram to Simonides; the passage suggests that the Amphiktyons procured, set up and engraved the stelai at the site (ἐπικοσμήσαντες), with the exception of the inscription for Megistias, which was literally 'inscribed' (ἐπιγράψας) by Simonides. Simonides' immediately recognizable reputa-

---

[49] The only other explicit fifth- or fourth- century citation of Simonides is Aristotle *rhet* 1.9.20 1367b (τὸ τοῦ Σιμωνίδου [= 26a Page]); the same epigram is cited anonymously by Thucydides (6.59). All other fifth- and fourth-century anonymous citations of epigrams are only later attributed to Simonides; explicit attributions begin again with the Alexandrians: see Molyneux 6-7.

[50] D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1981) 196.

tion as a poet would suggest to Herodotus' audience that he himself composed the epigram and supervised its inscription on the stone. Thus, the other two epigrams cited by Herodotus in the above passage appear not to be the work of Simonides, as the historian does not explicitly cite him as the author, and the context itself draws an explicit contrast between the Amphiktyons' collective memorials and Simonides' individual agency in the dedication of Megistias' epigram.[51]

The Megistias epigram consists of two attached elegiacs, each complete in itself and capable of standing independently. The μ-alliteration of the first line signals the close relationship between the deceased, his deed, and his memory by framing the name of the dead Megistias between his defeat of the enemy (Μῆδοι) and the monument that preserves his memory (μνῆμα)[52]; the accompanying assonance τόδε–ποτε connects the seer's past heroism with his present honor in the epigram. Thus, the first couplet is an extended introduction of the deceased and the situation of his death, while the second couplet provides the expanded narration of his paired heroic (οὐκ ἔτλη... προλιπεῖν) and mantic accomplishment (σάφα εἰδὼς)[53]; these relative clauses (ὅν ποτε...; μάντιος, ὃς τότε...) serve to parallel Megistias' martial and mantic skills in a style recalling epic imbedded narratives, a structure found also in the archaic epigrams for individual warriors: hóν | ποτ' ἐνὶ προμάχοις : ὄλεσε | θορος : Ἄρες (CEG 27.2). The Megistias epigram draws on further traditional motifs that span Homeric and archaic celebrations of war dead, such as the reference to κλέος implicit in κλεινοῖο. The image of death at the river Spercheios serves both to localize the death and to signify the threat of the Persians as threatening boundary-crossers[54], yet it also returns to traditional images of the warrior's death at a body of water (Achilles and Scamander, CEG

[51] See Molyneux 176-9 on the ambiguity of of ἐπιγράψας (literally: 'inscribe,' 'be responsible for the carving of the stone'), which leaves open significant questions about the respective roles of the Amphiktyons and the poet; if one interprets ἐπιγράψας as a signal of Simonides' authorship, it opens the possibility that the Herodotean audience is expected to view Simonides as the author of all three epigrams. Page (*Epigrammata Graeca* (Oxford, 1975) 18; *FGE* 231), however, interprets the inherent contrast in the passage between the Amphiktyons (ἐπιγράμμασι μὲν νῦν...) and Simonides (τὸ δὲ μάντιος...) and the clearer association of Simonides with Megistias' epigram as amounting to a negation of his authorship of 22 a and b. The association of 22a and b with Simonides can probably be attributed to a misreading of the Herodotean passage: see G. Kaibel, 'Quaestiones Simonideae,' *RhM* NF 28 (1873): 437-8 and Page *FGE* 231-2; Hauvette's argument (43) for the Simondean authorship of 22b based on Ionian forms (ξεῖνε, τῇδε, κείνων) is weak.

[52] Lausberg 124.

[53] Hauvette 46, Lausberg 124.

[54] Lausberg 124.

145) and the approaching fate of death (Κῆρας ἐπερχομένας[55]). Yet various traditional themes are also transformed within this epigram; in the collective sphere of war, Megistias' refusal to betray his polis (προλιπεῖν) connects the seer's loyalty with his necessary death by picking up the theme of death itself as departure (cf. λείπειν in the Homeric γόοι). In a similar adaptation of traditional usage, Megistias' ability to presage his own death (σάφα εἰδὼς) resonates with the visual nature of the warrior's 'beautiful death,' but also explains the seer's passivity in death (κτεῖναν): his refusal to actively evade death (οὐκ ἔτλη... προλιπεῖν) represents an active decision to remain subordinate to the polis (Σπάρτης ἡγεμόνας) while recognizing his future fate.

Like Simonides' epigram for Megistias, the other two epigrams cited by Herodotus draw upon and transform archaic motifs. 1) The traditional address to the passerby here the address omits the usual request for pity (CEG 27, 28) to emphasize the performance of martial duty.[56] 2) In a continued emphasis on geographic localization, the Peloponnesians are emphatically distinguished from the numbers of anonymous Persians by the designation of their origin (ἐκ Πελοποννάσου, 22a.2 P, cf. CEG 145).[57] 3) The epigrams draw a connection between their themes and their situation on the stone. In 22a, the small dimensions of the epigram and the numbers of the Greek forces are analogical[58], much like the written epigram and kore-statue together mark Phrasikleia as κόρε (CEG 24.1). 4) The essential connection of the epigram with its site (τῇδε, 22a.1, 22b.1) persists here without the traditional and explicit identification of the stone as a gravemarker.[59] 5) While the activity of the warrior continues to be emphasized (ἐμάχοντο 22a1), these epigrams also underline the passivity of death so as to indicate subordination to the political power of the polis (κείμεθα... πειθόμενοι 22b2, cf. 6P). 6) The dramatic fiction of oral exchange between the reader and the epigram is maintained; yet in 22b, the deceased speaks to the reader, an approach unusual in archaic epigram and underlining here the thorough decimation of the Spartan troops that prevents transmission of the message.[60]

The presence of the Megistias epigram together with 22a-b P shows the contrasts between individual and collective commemorations of war dead

---

[55] Hauvette 46.
[56] Hauvette 44.
[57] Hauvette 46.
[58] Lausberg 127.
[59] Lausberg 128.
[60] Lausberg 128.

following the same event. Both individual and collective epigrams maintain various common aspects of the archaic epigram that are inextricably linked to the grave epigram as written genre: the emphasis on the location of the gravesite with deictics, the interrelationship between the epigram and its context on the monument, and the historicity of the warriors' conflict. The collective memorials emphasize larger numbers in action, while minimizing the role of the individual and the common enemy. 22b emphasizes the final distance between warriors' gravesite and their homeland (ἀγγέλλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῇδε 22b1) which is mediated by the common purpose of polis and warrior, expressed in the epigram and bridged by the reader-as-messenger: ἀγγέλλειν... ὅτι...κείμεθα τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι.[61] Both collective epigrams emphasize the communal action of the warriors and their polis or area of origin (ἐκ Πελοποννάσου, Λακεδαιμονίοις) while the Megistias epigram imagines the seer-warrior as an individual actively supporting his group through his own encounter with the named enemy, an activity which generates a long-term memory for him in the form of the memorial.

While the collective epigrams continue various aspects of the archaic epigram connected with the initial uses of writing, their diction markedly breaks continuities with epic diction, a feature seen above in the Persian War epigrams. By contrast to the collective terms of communication in 22b (the collective address of the reader, ἀγγέλλειν, τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι), Megistias' epigram designates the deceased as κλεινός, a reference to individual κλέος which is generated by the seer's exemplary subordination to the Spartan leaders. This resonance of epic κλέος is matched by motifs of heroic death and individual activity (εἰδὼς) attached to Megistias' actions, which complement the collective purposes of the Spartan leadership. This contrast between individual and collective commemoration at Thermopylae is paralleled by Herodotus' contrast between the collective dedication of the Amphiktyons and his association of Simonides' epigram for Megistias with private reciprocity (κατὰ ξενίην). Simonides' dedication of his epigram in a private capacity alongside the Amphiktyons' monuments highlights the perceived possibilities of the monument as individual expression; indeed, the expression used of

[61] Lausberg 129, cf. Svenbro 65 and passim on the orality of the epigram as transcribed speech perpetually returned to orality by reading.

[62] Hdt. 2.182 (Amasis' dedications on Samos as a result of his friendship with Polykrates), 7.165 (Terillos, tyrant of Himera, motivates Amilkas, king of the Carchedonians, to fight on his side against Gelon out of private friendship).

Simonides' personal motivation in dedicating the individual epigram to Megistias (κατὰ ξενίην) appears elsewhere in passages of Herodotus where the characteristically private connections between despots determine their actions.[62] Thus, the juxtaposition of the individual and collective memorials for the same event reveals a continuing split between individual memory marked with elite referentiality and collective memorialization in which the individuals' names and action are subsumed by the survival and the historical and geographical persistence of their social or political group.

Within the larger context of Herodotus' narrative, these individual and collective epigrams are treated in parallel with other memorials of warriors at Thermopylae; a closer examination of the Herodotean context reveals the complex negotiation between oral and written memorials to the war dead. In the absence of a cited written source, Herodotus' knowledge of the names of the three hundred Spartans remaining with Leonidas appears to be based on oral sources; yet, as Pausanias (3.14.1) mentions an extant stele on Leonidas' grave which mentions the names of those who died with him, it appears that Herodotus privileges orally transmitted information over written source materials in his narrative.[63] Yet Herodotus' narration begins with oral memorials of the battle at Thermopylae and ends with the citation of the grave epigrams at the site; this leaves some ambiguity about the historian's priority of oral and written sources, in that it suggests a hierarchy of sources that begins with oral accounts and culminates in the written inscriptions. In his treatment of the Thermopylae epigrams, Herodotus precedes his citation of the epigrams with the orally transmitted narratives of Dieneces and the brothers Alpheus and Maron; the anecdote of Dieneces not only draws on oral sources, but celebrates oral communication that amounts to a show of bravery and produces an oral memorial for the dead, which is itself orally transmitted:

> Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ καὶ Θεσπιεέων τοιούτων γενομένων ὅμως *λέγεται* ἀνὴρ ἄριστος γενέσθαι Σπαρτιήτης Διηνέκης· τὸν τόδε *φασὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ ἔπος* πρὶν ἢ συμμεῖξαί σφεας τοῖσι Μήδοισι, *πυθόμενον* πρός τευ τῶν Τρηχινίων ὡς ἐπεὰν οἱ βάρβαροι ἀπίωσι τὰ τοξεύματα, τὸν ἥλιον ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθεος τῶν ὀϊστῶν ἀποκρύπτουσι. τοσοῦτο πλῆθος αὐτῶν εἶναι. τὸν δὲ οὐκ ἐκπλαγέντα τούτοισι *εἰπεῖν*, ἐν ἀλογίῃ ποιεύμενον τὸ τῶν Μήδων πλῆθος, ὡς πάντα σφι ἀγαθὰ ὁ Τρηχίνιος ξεῖνος *ἀγγέλλοι*, εἰ ἀποκρυπτόντων τῶν Μήδων τὸν ἥλιον ὑπὸ σκιῇ ἔσοιτο πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἡ μάχη καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἡλίῳ. ταῦτα μὲν καὶ ἄλλα τοιουτότροπα *ἔπεα φασι* Διηνέκεα τὸν Λακεδαιμόνιον *λιπέσθαι μνημόσυνα*. (Hdt. 7.226)

---

[63] Steiner 140-1.

Dieneces' verbal bravery serves as a sign of the warrior's prowess (ἄριστος γενέσθαι) and persists in transmission as an oral memorial to the speaker: ταῦτα μὲν καὶ ἄλλα τοιουτότροπα ἔπεα φασι Διηνέκεα τὸν Λακεδαιμόνιον λιπέσθαι μνημόσυνα. The narrative of Dieneces' speech is followed first by the brief narration about the martial success of the brothers Alpheus and Maron from oral sources (ἀριστεῦσαι λέγονται, 7.227) and finally by the citation of the inscribed epigrams, which themselves possess oral attributes: ἐπιγέγραπται γράμματα λέγοντα τάδε.[64] Herodotus' narrative thus reveals the new assimilation and almost interchangeable status of the written inscription and orally transmitted narratives of verbal and physical prowess.

The Megistias epigram and the other Thermopylae epigrams in the Herodotean context reveal various continuities in the classical epigram from the archaic period[65] yet several new features are present in the Megistias epigram that represent larger trends in the fifth and fourth centuries. The Megistias epigram and the classical epigrams impart more specific information about the occupation (μάντιος)[66], the political affiliation[67], and the geographical or political location of the deceased's activity[68]; it also displays new formal and thematic features including the con-

---

[64] Cf. similar expressions designating written letters throughout Hdt.: 1.124.1, 187.1, 187.5, 2.136.3, 141.6, 3.88.3, 4.91.1, 8.22.1.

[65] 1) the individual's κλέος (κλείνοιο, 6.1 P); cf. πατέρα εὐκ|λείζων ἐνὶ δήμῳ (CEG 83.4 [Attica, ca. 446-425?]), τόδε σᾶ]μα κεκλέσ|[εται (CEG 116 [Thessalia, ca. 500-475?]), Προκλείδα{ς} τόδε σᾶμα κεκλ|έσεται (CEG 142.1 [Acarnania, ca. 475-450?]).

2) the theme of death as departure: κεῖμαι |τεῖδε θανὸν πατρίδα| γε̃ν προλιπὸν (CEG 80i.2 [Attica, ca. 475-450?]), πατρὶ φίλωι καὶ μητρὶ λιπόντε ἀμφοῖν μέγα πένθος| (CEG 84.3 [Attica, ca. 440-430]), εἰ δέ τίς ἐστι |τέρψις ἐν ἡλικίαι, τήνδε θανὼν | ἔλιπες (CEG 95iii [Attica 5th c.]), πᾶσι λιποσα πόθον (CEG 104ii.2 [Attica, ca. 400?]), προλιποσ' ἥβης ἄνθος (CEG 174C3 [Sinope, ca. 475-450]), ἥλι|ον ἐξέλι|πον (CEG 176.2 [Panticapaeum, 5th c.]).

3) the question of the active death, mainly at the gravesites of warriors: ἀπώ[λεσας ἄγλα]o[ν ἥβην] / [γῆς π]έρι βαρνάμενος [καλλιχ]όρο πατρί[δος] (CEG 82.1-2 [Attica, ca. 450-425?]), hὸς περὶ τᾶς αὐτο γᾶς | θάνε μα⟨ρ⟩νάμενος (CEG 142 [Acarnania, ca. 475-450?]), hήβην / ['Hι]όνος ἀνφ' ἐρατῆς ὤ λεσ⟨ε⟩ βαρνάμενος (CEG 155 [Paros, 476/5]), cf. CEG 99i, 100, 101. Cf. on the passivity of a death or the dead–ἐνθάδε κεῖται and its variants (CEG 76, 80i, 85, 91, 95, 102, 105, 108, 126, 170, 175ii) and κεῖσθαι of the monument itself (CEG 84.1, 153.1).

[66] See Gerhard Neumann, 'Zum Verhältnis von Grabdenkmal und Grabinschrift in der archaischen und klassischen Zeit Griechenlands,' in H. Brunner, R. Kannicht, and K. Schwager, *Wort und Bild* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1979): 228-9 on the opening of the epigram to broader social classes in the fifth and fourth centuries, with the specification of occupation among its results.

[67] Σπάρτα μὲν πατρίς ἐστιν, ἐν εὐρυχ|όροισι ⟨δ'⟩ 'Αθάναις
ἐθράφθε, θανάτο | δὲ ἐνθάδε μοῖρ' ἔχιχε (CEG 77ii [Attica, ca. 500-475?])

[68] e.g. CEG 83 (Attica, 446-ca. 425?).

trast of psychological and physical activity (εἰδὼς οὐκ ἔτλη... προλιπεῖν), a classical motif that seems akin to the contrast between the presence of the body in the grave and the persistence of abstract memory of the deceased.[69] The classical period also reveals increasingly explicit references to grief and mourning within the epigram:

> κεῖσαι πατρὶ γόον δούς, Φυρκία. | εἰ δέ τίς ἐστι |
> τέρψις ἐν ἡλικίαι, τήνδε θανὼν | ἔλιπες. (CEG 95iii [Attica, 5th c.?])
> You lie here, giving your father reason for lament, Phyrkias. If there is any pleasure in youth, this you left behind when you died.

> Γάσστρο | νος τόδ | ε σᾶμα | φιλοξ | ένο ὃς μάλ | α πολλο | [ῖς]
> ἀστοῖ | ς καὶ ξε | ίνοις δο | κε θαν | ὸν ἀνία | ν.
> (CEG 123 [Thessaly, ca. 450-425?])[70]
> This is the σῆμα of the hospitable Gasstron, who caused especially many citizens and ξένοι grief when he died.

This association of grief and lament with the monument contrasts with the archaic epigrams, where comparatively few epigrams explicitly highlight their own function as a record of lament. As civic controls on all genres of funerary activity increase, accompanied by a growth in public and civic forms of mourning (e.g. tragedy), lament becomes a collective concern; when the epigram assumes the language of lament, this language must coexist with its own self-consciously collective emphases, which are determined by its nature as a publicly accessible text within the cemetery. Here, despite its traditional association with individual mourning, lament is used here as a foil for collective rather than private aspects of life: in CEG 95, the father's γόος is contrasted with the deceased's lost τέρψις, the collective pleasure opposed to lament in elegy[71]; in 123, grief is characterized as extending across various social groups, recalling a similar archaic construction: ἀσστοῖς καὶ χσένοισι Φάνες φίλος (CEG 112.1). As in

[69] e.g. CEG 155.1 (Paros, 476/5), where the σῆμα is characterized as μνῆμ' ἀρετῆς. This contrast between physical and psychological activity is preceded both by the traditional juxtaposition of opposites in lament and epigram, and by the contrast in the reader's physical and psychological activity in reaction to the gravesite (CEG 28); on the motif, cf. Clairmont *Gravestone and Epigram* 52, Lausberg 140-1, Neumann 228.

[70] Cf. πέ]νθος ἀποιχόμενον (CEG 75.2 [Attica, ca. 550-480?]), πατρὶ φίλωι καὶ μητρὶ λιπόντε ἀμφοῖμ μέγα πένθος (84.3 [Attica, ca. 440-430]), ... μνήμηγ γάρ | αἰεὶ δάκρυτον ἔχοσα | / ἡλικίας τῆς σῆς κλαί | ει ἀποφθιμένης. (97.3-4 [Attica, 5th c.?]); πένθος θε͂κεν | ἀποφθίμενος (113.2), θ]ρε͂νον ἔθεκα (114.2 [Boeotia, 479?]), μητρὶ δάκρυτον ἄχος (153.2 [Amorgos, ca. 450?]). Cf. Clairmont *Gravestone and Epigram* 53 on the more frequent thematization of private grief in the classical period.

[71] Archil. 11, 13.1-2, 215W.

Herodotus' citation of spoken and inscribed memorials of Thermopylae, the classical epigrams likewise encompass greater individual detail on the inscribed monument and point to an increasing acceptance of co-existing oral and written memorials.

The increasingly public contexts and controls of mourning change the individual epigram, allowing it both to assume aspects of lament and to be considered as a commemorative genre parallel to orally transmitted forms of memorialization. Conversely, the prominence of the lament within the epigram reveals its position as a necessary and vital form of individual expression within the group; despite civic controls on mourning, lament's autonomy has already been seen in the generic self-assertion of Pindar's threnoi and re-emerges in Sophocles' *Antigone*, where lament is viewed as a definitive part of the oral exchange of the polis, as I will discuss in the following chapter. The Herodotean history reveals the continued co-existence and ambiguities both of lament as an individual expression based on personal motivations and potentially subversive interests, and of the inscribed epigram, which remains associated with eastern despotism and with both permanence and potential ambiguity of meaning. Ultimately, oral and inscribed memorials for the same event co-exist and are treated as parallel historical sources, while the divide between individual and collective memorials is set in increasing relief by the juxtaposition of private and public monuments for the same event. This acceptance of parallel private and public mourning in lament, oral anecdotes, and inscriptions reveals an increasing acceptance of the different genres of mourning as mutually exclusive yet complementary and necessary genres of memory in collective life. Beyond Herodotus' histories, classical genres and representations of mourning such as tragedy and the funeral oration ultimately acknowledge the role of lament as a primary element of private ritual and as the basis for other types of private and public communication about the dead.

3.3 *Sophocles'* Antigone: *Lament, Burial, and Communication in the Polis*

Attic tragedies allow us insight into the position of lament and death ritual in the fifth-century polis. In staging both laments and the reactions of their audiences, tragedies offer one representation of contemporary perspectives on the conduct of lament and death ritual.

Lament in tragedy is designated by a wide spectrum of vocabulary that appears to be used indiscriminately of genre, including γόος and

θρῆνος.[72] While tragic characters often lament in other contexts, there are relatively few complete formal laments following a death and constituting the initial reaction to that death.[73] Otherwise, much as within the Homeric epics, there are also partial laments for the dead interrupted to turn to other concerns or to action; imperfect laments where the mourner has no access to the dead; laments for one's own or another's anticipated death; and laments where an anticipated death did not occur.[74] As so few of the deaths represented in tragedy are formally lamented, it can be concluded that the portrayal of lament is a dramatic rather than a structurally necessary element of the tragic drama.[75] Rather than that lament occurs at the death of central characters as in epic or in the case of extraordinary deaths as in funerary epigram, the tragedians portray formal lament when all characters share a recognition of loss at the individual death, even when the dead is not a protagonist. Yet deaths may remain unlamented when they are overshadowed by another major disaster or negative circumstances such as war (e.g. the overshadowing of Jocaste's death by Oedipus' blindness in Sophocles' *OT*); when they are directly caused by a character present on stage (e.g. Pentheus in Euripides' *Bacchae*); and when they are compensated by heroic status or divinity obtained in death.[76] The common recognition of loss in an individual death is not necessarily a personal one, but a recognition of a breach in the community left by the departure of one of its members[77], a view of lament which seems connected with the nature of tragedy as a public and political performance.

Drawing on traditions of ritual lament, the formal lament in tragedy usually features a principal mourner who is either kin to the deceased or a character for whom the death represents a severe loss and who therefore takes on the role of the ἔξαρχος θρήνων, the leader of the lament, who is accompanied by the tragic chorus.[78] The text of the tragedies indicate that mourning gestures performed on stage echo those used in ritual and

---

[72] Dorothy Marie Koonce, 'Formal Lamentation For the Dead in Greek Tragedy.' Diss. University of Pennsylvania, 1962: 7-12.

[73] See Koonce 18. Aeschylus *Persae* 908-1077, *Septem* 822-1004, *Choephori* 306-478; Sophocles *Ajax* 891-960, *Antigone* 1261-1346, *OC* 1670-1750; Euripides *Alcestis* 393-415, *Hippolytus* 811-855, *Andromache* 1173-1225, *Suppliants* 798-836, 1123-1164, *Trojan Women* 1287-1332, *Rhesus* 895-914.

[74] Koonce 18.

[75] Koonce 19-20.

[76] Koonce 22-26.

[77] Koonce 29.

[78] Koonce 47ff.

appearing in the Homeric representations – embracing the deceased (e.g. Euripides *Alcestis* 401-403), self-inflicted injuries such as tearing the hair, beating of the breast and head and the scratching of cheeks (e.g. Aesch. *Septem* 854-860), and verbal expressions including inarticulated cries, exclamations, repetitions, and a minimum of imagery.[79] While the personal detail present in the laments over Patroclus and Hector remains absent from the tragic laments, basic elements of the lament remain common to the Homeric and tragic representations, such as the mourners' cries, the invocation of the dead, the theme of death as separation or departure[80], and the expression of impossible wishes for the mourner's own death or that the manner of the deceased's death had been different.[81] As in both Homeric lament and epigram, death is seldom attributed to divine forces which, when named, are designated as θεός, δαίμων, τύχα, or 'Ερινύς—making the role of the gods in connection with death incidental and indefinite.[82] Thus, formal laments in tragedy maintain many aspects of our evidence for ritual lament as well as of Homeric representations of oral lament, while also serving as a central dramatic medium for the tragedian to foreground the significance of death in a play or to create plot tension with issues surrounding lament and death ritual.

Like lament, burial and denial of burial remain a significant plot theme in tragedy as in epic poetry, and thus the narrative closure of tragedy is often associated with the closure of death ritual. Nonetheless, this tragic closure is often complicated by the recurring motif of the exclusion of mourners either because of their ambiguous status (e.g. Medea's exclusion of Jason from the burial of their children) or because of the mystical or ideological distance between the mourner and the deceased (e.g. Antigone's exclusion from Oedipus' death, Odysseus' exclusion from Ajax's burial).[83] Death ritual thus represents a central element of the plot and its closure in tragedy, but remains linked with ambiguities regarding

---

[79] Koonce 99-120. Koonce (111-120) notes that the repetition in the formal laments of tragedy are not necessarily analogous to the repetition of meaningful words in ritual contexts, as the repetitions are not connected with invocation of the dead and hymnic or magical formulae, but tend to be line-initial and emphatic rather than related directly to ritual activity.

[80] Again, as in Homeric lament, characterized by the verb λείπειν, e.g. Eur. *Alc.* 406-407 (λείπομαι φίλος / μονόστολός τε ματρός) or Andr. 1205 (δόμον ἔλιπες ἔρημον).

[81] Koonce 124-130.

[82] Koonce 129-130; e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 1273, 1346.

[83] Deborah Roberts, 'The Frustrated Mourner: Strategies of Closure in Greek Tragedy,' in R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell, eds., *Nomodeiktes: Studies in honor of M. Ostwald* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1993): 573-589.

death and the relationship between mourners and the dead. Similarly, tragedy often characterizes lament as necessary but ambiguous, associating it with the feminine and the barbarian (*Persians*), with potential civic unrest (*Seven against Thebes*), and with cycles of revenge, excess, and primitive or pre-political activity (*Oresteia*).[84] In response, tragedy advances two strategies of control – the transformation of the dangerous female voice into various appropriate civic forms (e.g. the Erinyes, *Eum.* 778-1047) and the suppression of lament by masculine authority (*Antigone*).[85]

As a tragedy, Sophocles' *Antigone* represents a genre that displays hallmarks of oralcy, in that its fixed text can be performed in the absence of the author and serves as a dialogue with other written tragedies while it can engage in revision and critique of oral traditions and can accomodate variations in live performance.[86] The written stages of composition and transmission of tragedy, as well as its performance within a civic context, represent the possibility for civic influence on and control of its communication.[87]

While the *Antigone* does not directly confront the issue of different oral, written, and iconographic media available to the mourner, it superimposes the various oppositions inherent in death ritual over the opposition between informal communication among individuals and formal, state-controlled communication within the polis. The association of mourning with informal communication suggests the indispensible presence yet subversive potential of both the oral lament and the physical act of burial. While Homeric depictions of lament focus on the social consequences of death for specific individuals or groups and the Pindaric threnoi lack overt references to the political impact of their performance, Sophocles' *Antigone* depicts the polis as intimately intermeshed with the private circles of mourning kin, so that private lament becomes a necessary feature of the city's response to the death of its members. In the *Antigone*, neither lament nor burial engages itself with the diachronic preservation of the deceased's memory; rather, they constitute modes of contemporary com-

---

[84] Holst-Warhaft 128-144; Euripides' *Medea* 191-203 implies that lament possesses therapeutic potential, but, as the tragic action reveals, this therapeutic aspect of mourning does not necessarily divert violence (cf. Holst-Warhaft 167-9). On the cycle of vendettas initiated by lament, see also Charles Segal, *Sophocles' Tragic World: Divinity, Nature, Society* (Cambridge, MA, 1995) 119.

[85] Segal *Tragic World* 119-120.

[86] See Charles Segal, 'Tragedy, Orality, Literacy,' *Oralita: Cultura, Letteratura, Discorso* ed. Bruno Gentili and Giuseppe Paioni (Rome, 1985): 199-231 and 'Verité, Tragedie, et Ecriture,' *Les Savoirs de l'Écriture en Grèce ancienne*, ed. Marcel Detienne (Lille, 1988): 330-358.

[87] Seaford 219-220.

munication among the living members of the polis, distributing praise and blame, as for example in the association of Antigone's defiance with κλέος (502, 695), Ismene's and the citizens' mourning for Antigone in disapproval of her punishment (526-7, 693-5), and Creon's continuation of hostilities with Polyneices through his ban on burial. This immediacy and civic focus of mourning in tragedy can in part be seen as a metaphor for the tragic performance itself, a staged lament within a civic context with little concern about generating diachronic memory. The *Antigone* thus suggests an increasing distinction between immediate death rituals, associated as they are with informal communication, and the transmission of long-term memory, which resides with the polis through the media of the epitaphios, the gravemarker, and gestures that are analogous to them (μνῆμ' ἐπίσημον, 1258) as well as through the processes of decision-making within the city, exemplified by the very conflict of Creon and Antigone.

Sophoclean tragedy exhibits a broad range of different registers of lament, which often still retain aspects of their distinctive Homeric significance but also take on a certain flexibility for dramatic effect and meaning. Various distinctions between male and female forms of grief and lament, as well as distinctions between informal and ritual lament persist. While it is now often interchanged with the generic term θρῆνος, the γόος is still characterized as a distinctively female lament accompanied by ritual movement and often associated with a birdlike sound or with the song of the nightingale[88]:

> ἀλλ' ὡς τάχος τὸν παῖδα τόνδ' ἤδη δέχου,
> καὶ δῶμα πάκτου, μηδ' ἐπισκήνους γόους
> δάκρυε. κάρτα τοι φιλοίκιστον γυνή.
> πύκαζε θᾶσσον. οὐ πρὸς ἰατροῦ σοφοῦ
> θρηνεῖν ἐπῳδὰς πρὸς τομῶντι πήματι (*Aj.* 578-582 [Ajax]).

> ἦ που παλαιᾷ μὲν σύντροφος ἁμέρᾳ
> λευκῷ τε γήρᾳ μάτηρ νιν ὅταν νοσοῦν-
> τα φρενοβόρως ἀκούσῃ,
> αἴλινον αἴλινον

[88] *Aj.* 973 (Tecmessa), Ant. 427, 883 (Antigone), 1247 (Eurydike), *El.* 81 (Electra), 103-9 (Electra as a nightingale, interchanged γόος and θρῆνος), 139 (Electra as a nightingale), 243, 291, 353, 375, 379, 870 (Electra); *OC* 1607-9, 1620-1623 (the mourning of Oedipus and his daughters, interchanged with κλαίειν), 1668 (Oedipus' daughters); *OT* 30 (Theban mourning during the plague), 1249 (Jocaste); *Trach.* 49-51 (Deianeira's lament for the absent Heracles), 936-942 (Hyllos for Deianeira).

οὐδ' οἰκτρᾶς γόον ὄρνιθος ἀηδοῦς
σχήσει δύσμορος, ἀλλ' ὀξυτόνους μὲν ᾠδὰς
θρηνήσει, χερόπληκτοι δ'
ἐν στέρνοισι πεσοῦνται
δοῦποι καὶ πολιᾶς ἄμυγμα χαίτας. (*Aj.* 624-634 [chorus])

The γόος is viewed as a necessary part of the death ritual of kin, without which the mourner becomes guilty of neglect.[89] Even without clearly defined representations of γόοι in *oratio recta*, the Sophoclean γόος shares various aspects with the Homeric representation, including diction (γόον... σχήσει δύσμορος *Aj.* 630-1) and motifs such as the association of the γόος with the interior of the house (*Ant.* 1246-9) and the deceased's leaving the mourner with γόοι: Αἴας γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐκέτ' ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ/ λιπὼν ἀνίας καὶ γόους διοίχεται. (*Aj.* 972-3 [Tecmessa]).

In Sophoclean tragedy, the γόος still remains an ambiguous form of lament, which is viewed as belonging within the interior of the house and away from the public because of its potentially subversive nature:

καὐτὸς τεθάμβηκ'. ἐλπίσιν δὲ βόσκομαι
ἄχη τέκνου κλυοῦσαν ἐς πόλιν γόου
οὐκ ἀξιώσειν, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ στέγης ἔσω
δμωαῖς προθήσειν πένθος οἰκεῖον στένειν (*Ant.* 1246-9).

Accordingly, male characters still explicitly distance themselves from the γόος, which is understood as a female form of expression:

...γόου δὲ μηδὲν εἰσίδω δάκρυ,
ἀλλ' ἀστένακτος κἀδάκρυτος, εἴπερ εἶ
τοῦδ' ἀνδρός, ἔρξον... (*Trach.* 1199-1201 [Heracles])

στέναζε ταῦρος ὡς βρυχώμενος. (*Aj.* 317-322 [Tecmessa])

The θρῆνος becomes associated with women's conventional laments and is essentially equivalent to the γόος, as seen in the frequent interchangeability or juxtaposition of the two terms.[90] Like the γόοι, θρῆνοι are often

---

[89] *El.* 243, 870 (Electra and Agamemnon).

[90] αἰσχύνομαι μέν, ὦ γυναῖκες εἰ δοκῶ
πολλοῖσι θρήνοις δυσφορεῖν ὑμῖν ἄγαν.
ἀλλ', ἡ βία γὰρ ταῦτ' ἀναγκάζει με δρᾶν,
σύγγνωτε. πῶς γάρ, ἥτις εὐγενὴς γυνή,
πατρῷ ὁρῶσα πήματ' οὐ δρῴη τάδ' ἄν... (*El.* 254-8 [Electra])
Cf. other θρῆνοι at *Aj.* 631 (Ajax's mother), *El.* 88, 94 , 104 , 231, 530 (Electra), 1469 (Aigisthos); *Phil.* 208 (cries of Philoktetes as like a θρῆνος).

subject to control by external male figures[91] and characterized as ineffective in comparison to physical action (*Aj.* 850-3[92]).

Informal mourning in small groups is designated both with γόος and with κλαίειν, much as in the Homeric poems:

> ... ἐς δὲ γούνατα
> πατρὸς πεσοῦσαι ᾤκλαιον οὐδ' ἀνίεσαν
> στέρνων ἀραγμοὺς οὐδὲ παμμήκεις γόους (*OC* 1607-9, cf. 1620-3).

κλαίειν retains its nature as an adaptable 'spontaneous' lament used by individuals or groups of both genders in informal settings, and thus remains similarly attached to the γόος.[93] Its explicit connection with tears and other disfigurement of the body resonates with the similar Homeric usages:

> ἐγὼ δ' ὁρῶσα δύσμορος κατὰ στέγας
> κλαίω, τέτηκα, κἀπικωκύω πατρὸς
> τὴν δυστάλαιναν δαῖτ' ἐπωνομασμένην
> αὐτὴ πρὸς αὑτήν. οὐδὲ γὰρ κλαῦσαι πάρα
> τοσόνδ' ὅσον μοι θυμὸς ἡδονὴν φέρει. (*El.* 282-6 [Electra][94])

Like its Homeric counterpart, κλαίειν is a 'spontaneous' lament that forms an essential part of the death ritual (ἐκκεκηρῦχθαι τὸ... ἐᾶν δ' ἄκλαυτον, ἄταφον, *Ant.* 27-9 [Antigone]). Thus, though θρῆνος and γόος become increasingly assimilated, γόος and κλαυθμός are still distinguished as the primarily female lament required by custom yet avoided by men and as the spontaneous lament associated with self-disfigurement, respectively.

ἄχος continues to designate men's grief at death and dishonor[95] and is

---

[91] e.g. Ajax stops Tecmessa's mourning (*Aj.* 578-582), Theseus stops the mourning of Oedipus' daughters (*OC* 1751) and the chorus echoes his sentiment (*OC* 1778).

[92] ἦ που τάλαινα, τήνδ' ὅταν κλύῃ φάτιν,
ἥσει μέγαν κωκυτὸν ἐν πάσῃ πόλει
ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἔργον ταῦτα θρηνεῖσθαι μάτην.
ἀλλ' ἀρκτέον τὸ πρᾶγμα σὺν τάχει τινί .
Cf. *Aj.* 578-582, where Ajax illustrates the ineffectiveness of lament with the image of a doctor singing θρῆνοι over pain that requires surgery.

[93] *Ant.* 980 (children of Phineus), *El.* 282-6, 1117-1122 (Electra), *OC* 1607-9, 1620-3, *OT* 1490 (Oed.'s daughters), *Trach.* 153, 905, 909 (Deianeira), 936-942 (Hyllos), 1070-4 (Heracles). κλαίειν is also used of regret (*Ant.* 754 [Haemon], *OT* 401 [Tiresias]).

[94] Cf. Hom. *Od.* 8.521-7:...αὐτὰρ 'Οδυσσεὺς
τήκετο, δάκρυ δ' ἔδευεν ὑπὸ βλεφάροισι παρειάς.
ὡς δὲ γυνὴ *κλαίῃσι* φίλον πόσιν ἀμφιπεσοῦσα...
ἡ μὲν τὸν θνῄσκοντα καὶ ἀσπαίροντα ἰδοῦσα
ἀμφ' αὐτῷ χυμένη λίγα *κωκύει*...

still connected with the question of activity in response to grief:

> μή, μὴ ἄναξ, ἔθ' ὧδ' ἐφάλοις κλισίαις
> ἐμμένων κακὰν φάτιν ἄρῃ.
> ἀλλ' ἄνα ἐξ ἑδράνων
> ὅπου μακραίωνι
> στηρίζῃ ποτὲ τᾷδ' ἀγωνίῳ σχολᾷ,
> ἄταν οὐρανίαν φλέγων.
> ἐχθρῶν δ' ὕβρις...
> ἐμοὶ δ' ἄχος ἕστακεν
> (*Ajax* 190-200 [chorus])

Occasionally, ἄχος for women's grief also appears where a woman experiences sorrow in the absence of male mourners, and thus assumes their role[96]; this female use of ἄχος highlights mourner's lack or appropriation of individual agency in response to her grief where a male relative is absent, as in Tecmessa's potential enslavement after Ajax's death (*Aj.* 948), Electra's helpless mourning in the absence of help from her siblings (*El.* 155), and Antigone's exclusion from Oedipus' death (*OC* 1712).

As with ἄχος, the characteristic female (κωκυτός) and male (οἰμωγή, στοναχή) cries at the sight of the dead or at hearing negative information remain generally distinguished by gender, but also display greater flexibility in performance by both genders. κωκυτός is still characterized as a high-pitched sound (ὀξέων κωκυμάτων, *Aj.* 321), which accompanies the γόος or θρῆνος (*El.* 103-9 [Electra]) and is rejected by men as ineffective (*Aj.* 315-322 [Tecmessa on Ajax], 850-3 [Ajax]). κωκύειν occurs at the sight of the dead or at hearing about death or other negative events[97] and is considered, like the γόος, to be part of the essential death ritual:

> τὸν δ' ἀθλίως θανόντα Πολυνείκους νέκυν
> ἀστοῖσι φασιν ἐκκεκηρῦχθαι τὸ μὴ
> τάφῳ καλύψαι μηδὲ κωκῦσαι τινα (*Ant.* 26-28, cf. 204)

In Sophoclean tragedy, as in the Homeric poems, οἰμωγή and στοναχή

---

[95] *Aj.* 153 (Ajax), 200, 707 (Ajax's companions), 948 (Tecmessa's mourning at her probable enslavement), 956 (Ajax's companions); *Ant.* 627, 1247 (Haemon), 1287 (Creon); *El.* 155 (Electra and her siblings), 159 (Orestes); *OC* 1712 (Antigone), *OT* 1355 (Oedipus' family), *Trach.* 642 (people mourning in Heracles' absence), 1035 (Heracles).

[96] Cf. the use of ἄχος in the Homeric poems in reference to Helen (ἀχνυμένη κῆρ, *Il.* 24.773) and Penelope (τὴν δ' ἄχος ἀμφεχύθη θυμοφθόρον, *Od.* 4.716), who are both women with exceptional levels of individual agency in the absence of men.

[97] *Ant.* 423 (Antigone at the sight of Polyneices' body), 1227 (Creon at seeing Haemon in the cave), 1302 (Eurydike on hearing about Haemon); El. 283 (Electra), *Trach.* 867 (Deianeira's nurse).

designate the male cry that corresponds to the female κωκυτός.[98] As with ἄχος, οἰμωγή also extends in tragedy to women who lack male relatives, and thus perhaps take over a conventionally male form of expression and the agency associated with it:

> οὐδὲν σ' [Tecmessa] ἀπιστῶ καὶ δὶς οἰμῶξαι, γυνή,
> τοιοῦδ' ἀποβλαφθεῖσαν ἀρτίως φίλου. (*Aj.* 940-1)

> οὕτω δὲ χαὔτη, ψιλὸν ὡς ὁρᾷ νέκυν,
> γόοισιν ἐξῴμωξεν, ἐκ δ' ἀρας κακὰς
> ἠρᾶτο τοῖσι τοὔργον ἐξειργασμένοις (*Ant.* 426-8)

While Tecmessa's οἰμωγή is understood as acceptable in the absence of her male protector, Antigone's mourning bridges male (ἐξῴμωξεν) and female attributes (γόοισιν) of lament, which is one of the central attributes of her character, as I will discuss further below; further, her curses and her attention to the actions of those desecrating Polyneices' corpse (τοὔργον ἐξειργασμένοις) similarly underscore her extraordinary concern with actions directed at the deceased.

Creon's reaction to his discovery of Haemon in the cave likewise encompasses several male and female forms of lament:

> τῷ δ' ἀθλίας ἄσημα περιβαίνει βοῆς
> ἕρποντι μᾶλλον ἆσσον, *οἰμώξας* δ' ἔπος
> ἵησι *δυσθρήνητον*...
> ὁ δ' ὡς ὁρᾷ σφε, στυγνὸν *οἰμώξας* ἔσω
> χωρεῖ πρὸς αὐτὸν *κἀνακωκύσας* καλεῖ... (*Ant.* 1209-1227).

Creon's profuse male and female mourning at his aural and visual recognition of Haemon represent a re-assertion of the necessary lament, which Creon has denied in his capacity as the ruler of the polis. While some of the central terms for grief and mourning such as γόος maintain characteristics similar to those in the Homeric representation of lament, there is a certain flexibility in the gender of the mourner, which could be variously

---

[98] οἰμωγή: *Aj.* 317 (Ajax), 940 (Tecmessa), 963 (enemies of Ajax); Ant. 427 (Antigone), 1210, 1226 (Creon); *El.* 123, 778 (Electra); *OC* 820 (Oedipus); *Phil.* 190 (Philoktetes); *Trach.* 783 (people in fear of Heracles), 790 (Heracles in pain), 932 (Hyllos). The στοναχή is a gender-neutral cry similar to κωκυτός and οἰμωγή and viewed as a conventional expression of mourning but less connected to the immediate moment of recognizing death visually or aurally and more associated with mourning in the longer term: *Aj.* 203 (Tecmessa and Ajax's κηδόμενοι), 322 (Ajax), *Ant.* 1249 (Eurydike), *El.* 133, 141, 959-962, 1076 (Electra for her father), 1172 (Electra for Orestes), 1180-4 (Orestes), 1211-2 (Electra for Orestes); *OC* 1647 (Oedipus' daughters and others), 1710 (Antigone); *OT* 64 (Oedipus for the city), Phil. 338-340 (Philoktetes), 806 (Neoptolemos), *Trach.* 846 (Deianeira).

attributed to a collapse and assimilation between male and female genres of the same type of mourning (e.g. οἰμωγή and κωκυτός as the cry at the sight of the dead). Yet it also could reflect the author's intentional attempt to call attention to crises in the plot, if we understand Creon's resumption of male and female mourning as a reflection of his abnormal ban on lament and woman's ἄχος or οἰμωγή as signaling the mourner's appropriation of male agency in the absence of other kin.

While burial and death ritual often form a part of the dramatic tension and closure of tragedy, lament also represents a central aspect of tragedy in its inquiry into the extent of individual and civic power over self-expression; though in this new civic context, the exploration of extremes in lament unites the Homeric and Sophoclean protagonists, who are both defined by crises in mourning. As we have seen above, the Sophoclean tragedies maintain many of the semantic distinctions between Homeric genres of lament and display various motifs typical of the Homeric representations of lament; the *Antigone* in particular reveals continuities with the traditional portrayals of lament: the association of marriage and lament[99], death as a departure (λείπειν)[100], the interrelationship of sight and lament[101], the scene of the female mourner's emergence from the house at the sound of mourning and the physical effect of the news of death on the mourner[102], the juxtaposition of opposites[103], the address of the dead in the second person[104], and the paralleling of parent and child in death.[105]

---

[99] *Antigone* passim, cf. *Il.* 24.764, 766 (Helen), *Od.* 4.736 (Penelope) and CEG 24 (Phrasikleia).

[100] καὶ τίς βίου μοι σοῦ λελειμμένῃ πόθος; (548 [Ismene]), cf. *Il.* 19.288 (Briseis), 22.483, 24.725-6 (Andromache).

[101] ἡ παῖς ὁρᾶται κἀνακωκύει, 423; Here, Antigone is observed by the guard (ὁρᾶται, 423; ἰδόντες, 432) as she mourns at the sight of Polyneices' bare body: ψιλὸν ὡς ὁρᾷ νέκυν, / γόοισιν ἐξῴμωξεν (426-7). Vision plays a central role both in the sense of insight into a situation which is not communicated in the dysfunctional polis (Kr. σὺ τοῦτο μούνη τῶνδε Καδμείων ὁρᾷς / Ant. ὁρῶσι χοὖτοι. σοὶ δ' ὑπίλλουσι στόμα 508-9) and in Creon's recognition of the deaths of Haemon (ὦ κτανόντας τε καὶ / θανόντας βλέποντες ἐμφυλίους 1264) and of Eurydice (ὁρᾶν πάρεστιν... κακὸν τόδ' ἄλλο δεύτερον βλέπω τάλας 1294-5). These motifs are paralleled by the traditional motif of 'seeing the light' as life itself: 880, 1331. For the traditional connection of sight and mourning, cf. κωκύειν in the Homeric tradition and the visual aesthetics of the grave monument: perhaps we are to see here also a metaphor for the theater-going experience itself, in which the audience views staged lament.

[102] 1183-9 (Eurydice), cf. Andromache (*Il.* 22.437ff.). See Segal *Tragic World* 133-4 on the ring composition of Eurydice's mourning, in which others' mourning draws her out of the house (1187-8), and the news of Haemon's death sends her back into the house to mourn (1244-5).

[103] φρενῶν δυσφρόνων ἁμαρτήματα (1261), βουλεύματα... δυσβουλίαις (1265-9), πόνοι βροτῶν δύσπονοι (1276 [Creon]); cf. the γόοι passim, Pindar fr. 128b7.

Beyond these continuities in motif, the *Antigone* expands the significance of lament from a ritual mastery of the particular moment of death and the changing social roles of individual participants to a communication which has repercussions for the internal order of the polis; it is this repositioning of the lament within the civic context that redefines it as a necessary form of individual expression which shares the definitive orality of informal public discourse and thus can be regulated but never fully controlled.

Sophocles' *Antigone* centers on the tension between various forces in the polis that determine the proper application of mourning and burial rites[106]: male and female, civic structures and kinship groups, human and divine authority, as well as socialization and natural behavior.[107] The scholarship regarding the *Antigone* can be isolated into two main trends: a 'separative' point of view, which sees the protagonists Antigone and Creon as corresponding to these polar opposites that clash in the tragic performance, and an increasingly well-supported perspective that acknowledges the 'tragic ambiguities' in the situations of both characters and in the performance of ritual in this drama.[108]

Antigone and Creon represent ambiguities centered around interrelated issues of gender, civic power, and verbal and ritual modes of communication involved in mourning and burial. Their conflict in the *Antigone* reflects both persistent traditional themes and problems of mourning as well as their displacement and transformation within the civic context. As we have seen in the preceding chapters, the extraordinary death of the warrior or the unmarried demands special attention both in Homeric lament and in

---

[104] e.g. ἔθανες, ἀπελύθης (1268 [Creon mourns Haemon]); cf. the γόοι, CEG 50.1, 69.1.

[105] ἔχω μὲν ἐν χείρεσσιν ἀρτίως τέκνον, / τάλας, τὰν δ' ἔναντα προσβλέπω νέκρον. / φεῦ φεῦ μᾶτερ ἀθλία, φεῦ τέκνον (1298-1300 [Creon]); cf. *Il.* 22.477ff. (Andromache), *Od.* 4.722-741 (Penelope).

[106] Giovanni Cerri, *Legislazione orale e tragedia greca: Studi sull' Antigone di Sofocle e sulle Supplici di Euripide* (Naples, 1979) 17 argues that the attention given to the following contrasts in the *Antigone* has often unfairly submerged the true issue at the root of the drama – the treatment of the corpse and, with it, questions of sacrilege and pollution.

[107] See Th. C. W. Oudemans and A. P. M. H. Lardinois, *Tragic Ambiguity: Anthropology, Philosophy, and Sophocles' Antigone* (Leiden, 1987) 109-112 on some of these themes.

[108] A long trend of scholarship has been devoted to identifying either Antigone or Creon as the protagonist of the drama, a trend which is now being replaced by a balanced view of both characters as representing equally legitimate and ambiguous stances rather than extreme polar opposites: see D. A. Hester, 'Sophocles the Unphilosophical: A Study in the *Antigone*,' *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, 24, (1971): 13-9 for an overview of scholarly positions regarding the identity of the protagonist. For a more balanced perspective, see J. Hogan, 'The Protagonists of the Antigone,' *Arethusa* 5 (1972): 93-100, Oudemans and Lardinois 107ff., and C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Assumptions and the Creation of Meaning: Reading Sophocles' *Antigone*,' *JHS* 109 (1989): 134-148.

the archaic epigrams. The *Antigone* focuses on those points of liminality which these other genres seek to mediate by treating four supra- and infra-normal deaths that hinge on the action of the civic leader Creon and the reaction of Antigone: the deaths of a traitor-warrior (Polyneices), an unmarried maiden and criminal (Antigone), an unmarried youth and suicide (Haemon), and a suicide (Eurydice). This extreme situation is rooted in the traditional, intergenerational crisis of the Labdacid line[109], as well as in the extraordinary mourning behavior or treatment of each individual at or after death. Polyneices the traitor is denied burial but left within Theban territory to pollute it. The unmarried Antigone breaches gender roles by burying her brother and so experiences 'marriage to death' in capital punishment. Haemon dies by his own hand in response to Antigone's death after a failed murder attempt on his father. Finally, Eurydice follows her son in suicide after mourning him with an abnormally silent lament. These extraordinary deaths frame the confrontation between Antigone and Creon, which reveals the problems of gender, ritual procedure, and civic authority inherent in mourning and death ritual, as well as the integral role of lament, which is seen both as an uncontrollable form of individual expression and as part of the necessary oral exchange that defines the polis.

Antigone's burial of her brother's corpse represents a departure from the conventional female roles in mourning, where women lament and prepare the body, but men alone dominate the act of burying the dead and marking the burial location.[110] By burying Polyneices in defiance of Creon, Antigone simultaneously violates familial and civic authorities, since Creon serves both as the ruler of Thebes and as her κύριος by association with the Labdacids[111]; thus, the encounters between Antigone and Creon are repeatedly phrased as a conflict over the hierarchy of gender that is central to both familial and civic authority:

> ἦ νῦν ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἀνήρ, αὐτὴ δ' ἀνήρ,
> εἰ ταῦτ' ἀνατεὶ τῇδε κείσεται κράτη (484-5 [Creon][112])

[109] See Gerald Else, *The Madness of Antigone* [Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philos.-Histor.-Klass. Abhandlungen pt. 1] (Heidelberg, 1976) and Rohdich 29 on this theme.

[110] Foley 139, Oudemans and Lardinois 113, 167; cf. the similar Homeric convention, in which the diachronic marcation of the gravesite – the burning of the body, the burial, and the marcation of the gravesite with a mound or stele – is performed solely by men.

[111] Oudemans and Lardinois 167.

[112] For this recurring association between Antigone's rebellious act and her gender, see 61-2, 525, 578-9, 678-680, 740-1, 746, 756.

When Antigone performs the male act of burial and the handling of war dead, it represents a transgression which she associates with male heroic κλέος and the καλὸς θάνατος, the attributes of male death in epic and epigram:

> ἀλλ' ἴσθ' ὁποία σοι δοκεῖ, κεῖνον δ' ἐγὼ
> θάψω. *καλόν* μοι τοῦτο *ποιούσῃ θανεῖν* (71-2).
>
> ...πείσομαι γὰρ οὖν
> τοσοῦτον οὐδὲν ὥστε μὴ οὐ *καλῶς θανεῖν* (96-7).
>
> καίτοι πόθεν *κλέος* γ' ἂν *εὐκλεέστερον*
> κατέσχον ἢ τὸν αὐτάδελφον ἐν τάφῳ
> τιθεῖσα; (502-4)
>
> τὴν παῖδα ταύτην οἷ' ὀδύρεται πόλις,
> πασῶν γυναικῶν ὡς ἀναξιωτάτη
> κάκιστ' ἀπ' *ἔργων εὐκλεεστάτων* φθίνει (693-5, cf. 817).

Together with Haemon and the public at large, Antigone connects her performance of burial with κλέος, a quality reserved for the action of live heroes in epic and for the memory of their extraordinary deaths; the usually male act of burial, echoed here by ποιούσῃ (72) and ἔργων (695)[113], becomes a mode of καλὸς θάνατος for the unmarried sister of the deceased.

This καλὸς θάνατος is also a realization of her female identity through a figurative marriage-to-death, in which the death of Antigone and the concurrent suicide of Haemon represents a marriage-like union:

> ...ἐς δ' ὑγρὸν
> ἀγκῶν' ἔτ' ἔμφρων παρθένῳ προσπτύσσεται,
> καὶ φυσιῶν ὀξεῖαν ἐκβάλλει ῥοὴν
> λευκῇ παρειᾷ φοινίου σταλάγματος.
> κεῖται δὲ νεκρὸς περὶ νεκρῷ, τὰ νυμφικὰ
> τέλη λαχὼν δείλαιος ἔν γ' Ἅιδου δόμοις (1236-41 [messenger]).[114]

---

[113] Cf. ξυνπονήσεις καὶ ξυνεργάσῃ (41), τὸν αὐτόχειρα τοῦδε τοῦ τάφου (306), πόνος περισσός ἐστι τὰν Ἅιδου σέβειν (780).

[114] Cf. Antigone's death as a marriage: 653-4, 804-5, 891-4, 916-920. See R. F. Goheen, *The Imagery of Sophocles' Antigone: A Study of Poetic Language and Structure* (Princeton, 1951) 37-41, 120-1, Oudemans and Lardinois 184, Rehm 59-65. Rehm (70) goes so far as to see Creon's ban on the funeral as driving a wedge between the oppositions (civic and domestic, male and female) normally bridged by the marriage and the funeral, thus resulting in this confusion between the marriage and the funeral.

This fusion of the heroic death with erotic union in a woman's καλὸς θάνατος configured as marriage-to-death parallels the warrior's fulfillment of his identity through death in war, the male activity par excellence.[115] Antigone's marriage-to-death echoes themes both from lament and epigram – the mourning of the hero's wife as complementary to the warrior's work (here again suggesting Antigone's excessive and perhaps incestuous mourning for her brother) and the Phrasikleia epigram's association of death and marriage, where the deceased's fixed identity as a dead κόρε becomes her female κλέος. In light of the Homeric women's continued potentiality as mourners, Antigone's death in mourning also fulfills her expected role as a mourning woman; the oral-traditional narrative (ἤκουσα, 823; ὡς φάτις ἀνδρῶν, 829) of Niobe's death serves as an analogy and mythic exemplum for her own demise, as each woman is transformed into or enclosed in rock as she mourns her kin (823-832).[116] Yet Antigone's denial of her female reproductive and marital role accompanies a problematic and almost incestuous affection for her brother and, by association, an extreme loyalty to her natal family over her future marital family: φίλη μετ' αὐτοῦ κείσομαι, φίλου μέτα (73).[117] Only before her death does Antigone question her neglect of her marital family and her fellow citizens, which leads to her loss of membership in the larger social group (876-8). Thus, throughout the drama, Antigone's behavior adopts a spectrum of values, from male heroism (the καλὸς θάνατος) to a transgression of ritual, civic, and gender conventions, while the values of natal, marital, and civic affiliations are blurred and questioned in the context of her act of burial.

As Polyneices' relative and as the Theban ruler, Creon likewise displays inconsistent attitudes toward the ritual treatment of the dead. The ruler's criterion for isolating φίλοι depends on their loyalty to the state which he represents (187-190). Thus, despite his kinship with Antigone's brothers, Creon leaves Polyneices' body ritually desecrated but prescribes the ritual purifica-

---

[115] On the analogy, see J.-P. Vernant, 'La guerre des cités' in *Mythe et société en Grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1974) 38 and Nicole Loraux, 'Bed and War,' in *The Experiences of Tiresias: The Feminine and the Greek Man* (Princeton, 1995) 22-43 who builds on Vernant's analogy between female marriage and male war by noting that married women's self-realization in childbirth (i.e. the generation of new hoplites) is paralleled with the martial self-realization of men.

[116] Perhaps we are to see an assimilation between the mourning woman and the stele here, a parallel suggesting that Niobe and Antigone's agency in lament could match that of men's role in marking the physical gravesite.

[117] Cf. 891ff.. On Antigone's unusual privileging of her natal over her marital family, see Oudemans and Lardinois 112 and 173, Christina Elliot Sorum, 'The Family in Sophocles' *Antigone* and *Electra*,' *CW* 75 (1981-2): 201-211.

[118] Oudemans and Lardinois 162-3, Rehm 68.

tion of Eteocles' body (194-206).[118] While contemporary customs suggest that traitors might be denied burial in their own land, these bodies presumably found burial outside civic boundaries, either through the agency of the family or the inhabitants of bordering areas[119]; Polyneices' special position as war dead also suggests that proper procedure would also have been *anairesis*, a delivery of his body to the enemy forces of the Argives for burial.[120] Creon's misstep of leaving the unburied Polyneices within the city borders (1196-1204), together with his extension of civic authority into the realm of Hades[121], his excessive mutilation of Polyneices[122], and the execution of Antigone to prevent the pollution of the state, all represent the failure of civic authority within the religious and customary realm of death ritual.

Creon's actions pollute the polis and transform it into a Hades-like realm (1071-1083), where, as sacrifices fail (999-1022), Eurydice's suicide functions as a perverted sacrifice (σφάγιον 1291).[123] Creon's confusion of ritual and civic priorities is matched by an analogical confusion of domestic and civic values: ἐν τοῖς γὰρ οἰκείοισιν ὅστις ἔστ' ἀνὴρ / χρηστός, φανεῖται κἀν πόλει δίκαιος ὤν (661-2, cf. 183-4). Not only does Creon pollute the city through his capital punishment of Antigone, but also in leaving the dead Polyneices above ground and Antigone alive underground:

> νέκυν νεκρῶν ἀμοιβὸν ἀντιδοὺς ἔσῃ,
> ἀνθ' ὧν ἔχεις μὲν τῶν ἄνω βαλὼν κάτω,
> ψυχήν γ' ἀτίμως ἐν τάφῳ κατοικίσας,
> ἔχεις δὲ τῶν κάτωθεν ἐνθάδ' αὖ θεῶν
> ἄμοιρον, ἀκτέριστον, ἀνόσιον νέκυν (1067-71 [Tiresias]).

---

119 For sources, see Vincent Rosivach, 'On Creon, Antigone, and not Burying the Dead,' *RhM* 126 (1983): 193-211; cf. Cerri 18.

120 Rosivach 194-6, 207; according to Rosivach (197-205), the predominant Hellenic custom of returning enemy dead (*anairesis*) results from an apparent development away from mutilation of the enemy corpse common in Homeric poetry, which is increasingly associated with barbarian customs and divine disapproval.

121 Cerri 19, Hermann Rohdich, *Antigone: Beitrag zu einer Theorie des sophokleischen Helden* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1980) 38-9, Segal *Tragic World* 128-9, cf. also J. Dalfen, 'Gesetz ist nicht Gesetz und Fromm ist nicht Fromm (die Sprache der Personen in der sophokleischen *Antigone*),' *WS* n. F. 11 (1977): 16 on Creon's usage of σέβειν of the Labdacids' power (ὑμᾶς...τὰ Λαΐου / σέβοντας εἰδὼς εὖ θρόνων ἀεὶ κράτη 165-6) and of his own authority (ἁμαρτάνω γὰρ τὰς ἐμὰς ἀρχὰς σέβων; 744), thereby transferring and limiting a term of religious reverence to the political sphere.

122 ἄκλαυτον, ἄταφον, οἰωνοῖς γλυκὺν / θησαυρὸν εἰσορῶσι πρὸς χάριν βορᾶς (29-30), ἄθαπτον καὶ πρὸς οἰωνῶν δέμας / καὶ πρὸς κυνῶν ἔδεστον αἰκισθέν τ' ἰδεῖν (205-6). On Creon's ambiguous intent to mistreat and mutilate Polyneices' corpse as a misguided transferral of older (Homeric) values to the polis, see Rosivach 208-11.

123 Charles Segal, *Tragedy and Civilization: An Interpretation of Sophocles* (Cambridge, MA, 1981) 175.

Creon's solution to the crisis is analogically inverted: his priority is to bury the dead Polyneices before rescuing the live Antigone (1196-1205), contrary to the suggestions of the chorus (1100-1) and Tiresias (1066-1071).[124] Ultimately, Creon's position in familial, civic, and ritual realms is undermined by the destruction of his own kin, the failure of his leadership and his pollution of the polis; his own problematic stance and his resulting demise parallel Antigone's defiance in simultaneous over- and undervaluing of Polyneices and Creon as her kin. In conclusion, both Antigone and Creon can be seen to display ambiguous reactions to the extraordinary situation of Polyneices' death which result in the private, public, and ritual chaos in Thebes.

The crisis of the *Antigone* originates from the dysfunctional communication within the Theban polis, which is itself inseparable from the conflicts between private, civic, and divine priorities in the question of burial; these conflicts are centered on Creon's and Antigone's different usages of the key terms of debate, such as φίλος, κέρδος, σέβειν, and νόμος.[125] Yet beyond this static semantic opposition, the theme of communication develops throughout the plot as well; increasingly, Creon displays tyranny in his political philosophy[126], especially in his attempts to dominate dialogue, to control others' speech and to associate the polis itself with his own person and his own communication:

> ἐμοὶ γὰρ ὅστις πᾶσαν εὐθύνων πόλιν
> μὴ τῶν ἀρίστων ἅπτεται βολευμάτων,
> ἀλλ' ἐκ φόβου του γλῶσσαν ἐγκλήσας ἔχει,
> κάκιστος εἶναι νῦν τε καὶ πάλαι δοκεῖ...
> οὔτ' ἂν σιωπήσαιμι τὴν ἄτην ὁρῶν... (178-185 [Creon])

> Creon: ἄλλῳ γὰρ ἢ 'μοὶ χρή με τῆσδ' ἄρχειν χθονός;
> Haemon: πόλις γὰρ οὐκ ἔσθ' ἥτις ἀνδρὸς ἐσθ' ἑνός.
> Creon: οὐ τοῦ κρατοῦντος ἡ πόλις νομίζεται;
> Haemon: καλῶς ἐρήμης γ' ἂν σὺ γῆς ἄρχοις μόνος. (736-9)[127]

---

[124] Segal *Tragedy and Civilization* 176.

[125] Charles Segal, 'Sophocles' Praise of Man and the Conflicts of the Antigone,' in T. Woodard, ed., *Sophocles: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1966) 64-71 and, more recently and comprehensively on the same terms, see Dalfen 5-26.

[126] Anthony J. Podlecki, 'Polis and Monarch in Early Attic Tragedy,' in J. Peter Euben, ed., *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory* (Berkeley: UCalifornia Press, 1986) 98-9.

[127] cf. 241-4, 282-3, 315-20, 446, 757; see Helene Foley, 'Tragedy and Democratic Ideology: The Case of Sophocles' *Antigone*,' in Barbara Goff, ed., *History, Tragedy, Theory: Dialogues on Athenian Drama* (Austin: UTexas Press, 1995) 137; J. Ober and B. Strauss, 'Drama, Political Rhetoric, and the Discourse of Athenian Democracy,' in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin, eds., *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton UP, 1990): 259-60, Segal *Tragedy and Civilization* 163-4.

Although the terms used of Creon's position (στρατηγός, 8) and his edicts (κηρύγματα[128]) reflect the accepted practices of an Athenian general during wartime crises[129], the drama signals the dysfunctional communication within the polis both in the characterization of Creon as ruler, with the polis centered in his person (738) and other citizens viewed as potentially threatening (289ff.), as well as in the behavior of the citizens, which is marked by the spread of rumor (700) and by the fear of open engagement in political discourse (504-9, 690-2).[130]

As public dialogue is silenced by Creon's rule, popular speech at large and the individual actions of listening and informal communication become associated with Antigone's sphere of activity.[131] Antigone sets Creon's edicts (κήρυγμα, 8) in opposition to divine authority (οὐ γάρ τί μοι Ζεὺς ἦν ὁ κηρύξας τάδε, 450) and to her own actions, which she wishes her sister to broadcast in similarly public discourse (κηρύξῃς τάδε, 87). Antigone's reference to unwritten laws (ἄγραπτα κἀσφαλῆ θεῶν / νόμιμα 454-5, cf. 908) guiding her behavior is to be contrasted with Creon's similarly oral edicts, in that they suggest customary behavior based on uncontrolled, and by implication aristocratic, familial, and oral traditions preceding and thus threatening the contemporary pronouncements of the centralized polis.[132] In the ongoing tension between the diffuse oral exchange among the citizens and the inflexible and tyrannical edicts of the Theban ruler, the final prophecy of chaos is signaled by the incomprehensible omen birds of Tiresias, which serve as a prophetic analogy to the internal dysfunction of Thebes' political discourse: ἀγνῶτ' ἀκούω φθόγγον ὀρνίθων, κακῷ κλάζοντας οἴστρῳ καὶ βεβαρβαρωμένῳ (1001-2).[133]

---

[128] 8, 27, 32, 34, 161, 192, 203, 447, 550.

[129] William M. Calder III, 'Sophocles' Political Tragedy, *Antigone*,' *GRBS* 9 (1968): 392-3.

[130] Mary Whitlock Blundell, *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics* (Cambridge UP, 1989) 126-7.

[131] On Antigone's informal listening (φασιν 7, 27; κλύοις 19; λέγουσιν 23; ἤκουσα 823, φάτις 829, etc.) as contrasted with general public discourse, see Rebecca W. Bushnell, *Prophesying Tragedy: Sign and Voice in Sophocles' Theban Plays* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988) 51-2, Ober and Strauss 260ff., Segal *Tragedy and Civilization* 161-2.

[132] Cerri 13, B. M. W. Knox, *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* [Sather Classical Lectures 35] (Berkeley, 1964) 75-6, 91, 95-7 for other sources on the concept of the 'unwritten laws'; I believe Cerri rightly assesses the 'unwritten laws' as non-democratic in their lack of an explicit source and in the lack of general dialogue regarding these customs, therefore leading to their application by particular γένη or social classes (37); yet, conversely, I see no necessary democratic legitimation implied for Creon's κηρύγματα - νόμοι, as he does (13). Cf. Cerri 79-80 on the common theme of the unwritten law in the *Antigone* and Euripides' *Supplices*.

[133] Bushnell 57-8, 62; cf. Antigone's birdlike mourning: κἀνακωκύει πικρῶς / ὄρνιθος ὀξὺν φθόγγον (423-4) and Haemon's indecipherable final cries: ἀθλίας ἄσημα περιβαίνει βοῆς (1209).

Both Antigone's and Creon's modes of communication are problematic: neither Antigone's informal, diffuse, and potentially aristocratic or subversive discourse, nor Creon's centralized control of public dialogue can wholly master the liminality of Polyneices' death.

Together with the traditional problems associated with lament, this recurring contrast between informal communication and formal civic discourse determines the *Antigone*'s perspective on lament in the polis. In the *Antigone*, the question of death ritual resides not only in Antigone's individual act of rebellion and the citizens' reactions to it, but also in Creon's attempt to control lament over the dead Polyneices:

> Ἐτεόκλεα μέν, ὃς πόλεως ὑπερμαχῶν
> ὄλωλε τῆσδε, πάντ' ἀριστεύσας δορί,
> τάφῳ τε κρύψαι καὶ τὰ πάντ' ἐφαγνίσαι
> ἃ τοῖς ἀρίστοις ἔρχεται κάτω νεκροῖς.
> τὸν δ' αὖ ξύναιμον τοῦδε, Πολυνείκη λέγω,
> ὃς γῆν πατρῴαν καὶ θεοὺς τοὺς ἐγγενεῖς
> φυγὰς κατελθὼν ἠθέλησε μὲν πυρὶ
> πρῆσαι κατ' ἄκρας, ἠθέλησε δ' αἵματος
> κοινοῦ πάσασθαι, τοὺς δὲ δουλώσας ἄγειν,
> τοῦτον πόλει τῇδ' ἐκκεκήρυκται τάφῳ
> μήτε κτερίζειν μήτε κωκῦσαι τινα,
> ἐᾶν δ' ἄθαπτον καὶ πρὸς οἰωνῶν δέμας
> καὶ πρὸς κυνῶν ἐδεστὸν αἰκισθέν ἰδεῖν. (194-206)

Creon prescribes Eteocles' treatment in terms recalling the archaic warriors' epigrams: Ἐτεόκλεα... ὃς... (194[134]), ὄλωλε (195[135]), ἀριστεύσας (195[136]); by contrast, Polyneices' status as traitor and desecrator of temples (198-201) justifies Creon's refusal of burial to his body, while Creon's description of his activity picks up on the language used to describe the enemies defeated by Greek warriors: πυρὶ / πρῆσαι (200-1), δουλώσας (202).[137] Creon's epigraphic diction is paralleled by Antigone's language describing her fate as a καλὸς θάνατος (72, 97) and her Niobe exemplum in which the mourning woman becomes a stone monument (823-832). Through their epigraphic language, both protagonists attempt to impose a stable interpretation on death; yet the private assertion of Antigone and the public pronouncement

---

[134] Cf. τὸν δ' αὖ ξύναιμον τοῦδε, Πολυνείκη λέγω,/ ὃς γῆν πατρῴαν καὶ θεοὺς τοὺς ἐγγενεῖς / φυγὰς...198-200 (Creon), CEG 27.2 (hὄν | ποτ' ἐνὶ προμάχοις...), 112.2 ([hó]ς ποτ' ἀρισστεύον...).

[135] Cf. CEG 13.3 (νεαρὰν hέβεν ὀλέσαν | τα) and the identical 136.3.

[136] Cf. CEG 112.2 ([hó]ς ποτ' ἀρισστεύον...), 145.3 (πολλὸ | ν ἀριστεύ⟨ϝ⟩οντα)

[137] Cf. Persian war epigrams AII (ἄγχιαλομ πρεσαι ρ... ἄστυ) and AI (δούλιο[ν ἐμαρ).

of Creon in epigraphic diction parallel their consistently private and public perspectives on the place of mourning and thus fail to resolve the ongoing uncertainty about the role of death ritual in the polis.

While Creon's excessive intent to mutilate the body (205-6) matches his perception of Polyneices' violence against the city (201-2), it also echoes the importance of visual impact in mourning and memorials (αἰκισθέν ἰδεῖν, 206), as seen above in the Homeric κωκύειν, the καλὸς θάνατος, and the role of the archaic gravemarker as stand-in for the deceased's καλὸς θάνατος. The difference between the brother's burials is thus rooted in a contrast both between the native warrior and the traitor as well as between the prescribed burial and ritual gifts for Eteocles (194-5) and the ban on burial and lament for Polyneices, itself strongly associated by a k- and t-alliteration with the authority of Creon's edict:

> ...ἐκκεκήρυκται τάφῳ
> μήτε κτερίζειν μήτε κωκῦσαι τινα, (203-4 [Creon]).
>
> ἀστοῖσι φασιν ἐκκεκηρῦχθαι τὸ μὴ
> τάφῳ καλύψαι μηδὲ κωκῦσαι τινα. (27-8 [Antigone])

Creon's attempted control of lament is first breached by Antigone while burying her brother (ἡ παῖς ὁρᾶται κἀνακωκύει πικρῶς, 423) and is followed by the similar laments of Haemon and Eurydice. Tiresias predicts the onset of death and mourning in Creon's house as a result of his treatment of Polyneices and Antigone: φανεῖ γὰρ οὐ μακροῦ χρόνου τριβὴ / ἀνδρῶν γυναικῶν σοῖς δόμοις κωκύματα (1078-9); this prophecy is fulfilled by Haemon's final cries (ὀρθίων κωκυμάτων, 1206), and by the suicide of Eurydice in response to Haemon's death (κωκύσασα 1302, ᾔσθετ' ὀξυκώκυτον πάθος, 1316).[138]

The drama treats lament as both an integral and an ambiguous part of the life of the polis, occurring spontaneously and informally, and so subject to central control but unable to be banned. Within a larger civic context, lament functions as a signal of solidarity between mourner and mourned, much like the position of lament as a 'readable' and potentially subversive form of personal expression in the Herodotean histories. Ismene's weeping for Antigone serves as a sign of her affiliation with her sister and becomes the catalyst for Creon's inquiry into her guilt: καὶ μὴν πρὸ πυλῶν ἥδ' Ἰσμήνη, / φιλάδελφα κάτω δάκρυ' εἰβομένη (526-7); similarly,

[138] Cf. also Haemon's mourning for Antigone (ἀχνύμενος / [τῆς μελλογάμου νύμφης 627-8); and Eurydice's mourning for Haemon (γόου... στένειν, 1247-9).

the Thebans' mourning for Antigone suggests the place of lament as informal expression with public impact, as the citizens praise the act of an individual and criticize the action of the state:

> τὴν παῖδα ταύτην οἵ' ὀδύρεται πόλις,
> πασῶν γυναικῶν ὡς ἀναξιωτάτη
> κάκιστ' ἀπ' ἔργων εὐκλεεστάτων φθίνει (693-5).

Before her death, Antigone's final reversal reveals how her isolation from φιλία outside the family is linked to her own loss of marriage and proper lament in death; φιλία, marriage, and lament are shown to be interdependent in the relationship of individual and polis: ἄκλαυτος, ἄφιλος, ἀνυμέναι/ος ⟨ἁ⟩ ταλαίφρων ἄγομαι / τὰν ἑτοίμαν ὁδόν (876-8).[139]

Although the semantics of φιλία and the perspectives on marriage and mourning vary throughout the *Antigone*, the drama highlights the necessity of moderate lament in the interrelated individual and collective spheres of the polis, while it also depicts the political impact and the dangers of extreme lament. Whereas Antigone's and Haemon's loud laments mark scenes of danger, Eurydice's silence likewise signals the danger of her approaching suicide: ἐμοὶ δ' οὖν ἥ τ' ἄγαν σιγὴ βαρὺ / δοκεῖ προσεῖναι χἠ μάτην πολλὴ βοή (1251-2, cf. 1244-50).[140] Creon's recognition of Haemon's voice in the cave marks his first interpretation of others' communication:

> φωνῆς δ' ἄπωθεν ὀρθίων κωκυμάτων
> κλύει τις ἀκτέριστον ἀμφὶ παστάδα,
> καὶ δεσπότῃ Κρέοντι σημαίνει μολών.
> τῷ δ' ἀθλίας ἄσημα περιβαίνει βοῆς
> ἕρποντι μᾶλλον ἆσσον, οἰμώξας δ' ἔπος
> ἵησι δυσθρήνητον,' ὦ τάλας ἐγώ,
> ἆρ' εἰμὶ μάντις;...
> παιδός με σαίνει φθόγγος...' (1206-1214).

Creon's identification of his son's voice depends on a chain of interrelated communication (κλύει... σημαίνει) and interpretation (ἄσημα... μάντις), resulting in his first lament: οἰμώξας δ' ἔπος / ἵησι δυσθρήνητον,' ὦ τάλας ἐγώ... (1212-3). Thus, in parallel to the association of Antigone's mourning and individual communication, the ruler's recognition of lament occurs simultaneously with his participation in informal communication outside a civic context. Creon's final lament for his wife and son suggests that the appropriate place of mourning for the private individual lies

---

139 Rohdich 166.
140 Holst-Warhaft 165.

within the context of public acceptability : καὶ μὴν ὅδ' ἄναξ αὐτὸς ἐφήκει / μνῆμ' ἐπίσημον διὰ χειρὸς ἔχων... (1257-8 [chorus]). The chorus designates Creon's action of carrying Haemon's corpse as a μνῆμ' ἐπίσημον (1258) in suggestive allusion to epitaphios or grave monuments[141], thus forging a final link between Creon's individual lament and the monument as publicly acceptable forms of memorialization.

In the *Antigone*, death represents a world parallel to that of the living, which maintains its traditionally passive nature (e.g. κεῖσθαι 73, 76, 94), but also includes personified mortal φίλοι (65, 75, 542) and divine inhabitants (451, 749, 894).[142] For both Antigone and Creon, death represents an extension of life. For the former, it represents a continued reciprocity through burial, the achievement of a beautiful death in the service of the dead (72), and an eternal-perfect state of existence, while for the latter, it offers an extended sphere of influence for the polis through the treatment of the corpse (209-210).[143] It is this continuity between life and death that leads each protagonist to extreme positions of defiance and defense of the ban on Polyneices' burial. Polyneices' triple burial, twice by Antigone and finally by Creon, has been variously explained as a dramatic device heightening the tension for the encounter of the protagonists[144] or as an emblem of Antigone's double motives of ritual duty and φιλία.[145] However one chooses to interpret the multiple burial of Polyneices, the act of burial in each case represents less the preservation of memory of the individual or a demarcation of the gravesite, than a ritual duty (cf. the Homeric γέρας θανόντων) and the locus of conflict between the individual and

---

[141] Segal *Tragic World* 120-7 argues that the chorus' phrase μνῆμ' ἐπίσημον (1258), with its echo of epitaphios, attempts to apply a civic perspective to Haemon's death which is interrupted by Eurydice's lament and suicide. Segal (*Tragic World* 135-6) sees Antigone's, Haemon's, and Eurydice's laments as marking the gradual diminution of Creon's power as he continually denies the legitimacy of the female lament and death ritual; Segal thus sees the play as a conflict between two interpretations of death, the private lament and the public epitaphios. The textual evidence for this binary argument beyond l.1258 is meager; if anything, lament is shown to be both indispensible yet uncontrollable and therefore problematic. Rather than an opposition between lament and epitaphios, which is not mentioned explicitly in any phrase including 1258, the drama inquires into the ideal position of lament within the polis.

[142] Rohdich 34.

[143] Rohdich 36-9, 55; on the plot of the *Antigone* as a conflict regarding the nature of death as a perfect and eternal state or as a continuum, see Zeitlin 152.

[144] Calder 394-6.

[145] G. F. Held, 'Antigone's Dual Motivation for the Double Burial,' *Hermes* 111 (1983): 190-201 argues that the first burial is characterized by simple fulfillment of ritual obligations, while the second, technically unnecessary burial demonstrates Antigone's φιλία, in that her mourning is determined by female kinship: ἡ παῖς ὁρᾶται κἀνακωκύει πικρῶς / ὄρνιθος ὀξὺν φθόγγον, ὡς ὅταν κενῆς / εὐνῆς νεοσσῶν ὀρφανὸν βλέψῃ λέχος. (423-5)

the polis over the control of private expression. This motif reflects the shift at the gravesite toward greater and more explicit significance given to the communication of the survivors within their group, which is already a predominant trend in the archaic grave epigrams. By association with lament as informal communication, burial takes on a newly ambiguous position between controlled civic activity and informal and personal act. By contrast to the universally positive characterization of burial qua act in the Homeric epics and in the archaic epigrams, the *Antigone* reflects coexisting and contrary motivations for burial in the contemporary polis: individual initiative (burial as individual or familial communication), civic control (burial as political medium), or divine will (burial as a performance of ritual duty and the avoidance of pollution, both of which factors are open to individual and civic interpretation).

Ultimately, both protagonists experience a reversal: isolated and condemned to death, Antigone recognizes the value of marital and civic life as the basis of her own existence and the continuity of her ruling family.[146] Creon also realizes the interdependence of his own family with the polis and its changes in fortune; as his misguided attempts to save the polis through quasi-tyrannical measures conclude in pollution, his own final state echoes that of Antigone, an isolated individual mourning for a ruined γένος.[147] Each protagonist finally loses or at least compromises both natal (Antigone and Polyneices, Creon and Haemon) and marital (Haemon, Eurydice) connections as well as ties to the polis (capital punishment, failed leadership). The concluding episodes of the tragedy also find an increasing blur between pure and impure extremes: while the living Antigone is entombed (1068-71), the dead Polyneices and the failed Creon remain above ground. With this indeterminate conclusion, the *Antigone* suggests a dramatic dialogue within the democratic theater regarding the boundaries of funeral behavior within the Athenian polis[148] and the nature of death itself – is it the end of life, a state which

---

146 831-4, 867-8, 876, 904-920.

147 Foley 138-9, Knox 111-5, Oudemans and Lardinois 196, Rohdich 151, Segal *Tragic World* 131.

148 See Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Assumptions and the Creation of Meaning: Reading Sophocles' *Antigone*,' *JHS* 109 (1989): 136 and Froma I. Zeitlin, 'Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama,' in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin, eds., *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton, 1990): 130-167 on the complex interrelationship between the mythical Theban backdrop and contemporary Athens: Thebes functions as a 'negative model to Athens' manifest image of itself with regard to its notions of the proper management of city, society, and self' (Zeitlin 131), onto which individual and civic issues can be displaced for collective examination.

allows continued reciprocity, or a realm which calls for political control?[149]

In this sense, the *Antigone* reflects questions regarding the treatment of the dead that persist throughout and beyond the period of this drama. Not only was female funerary activity under civic control since the Solonian legislation, but Athenian policies foregrounded the problems in the treatment of deceased traitors to the state; both living and dead members of families deemed sacrilegious or traitorous were habitually exiled from Athenian territory.[150] As a document of attitudes toward funerary activity, the Sophoclean *Antigone* focuses directly on the contemporary points of liminality which the previous genres of memorialization attempt to mediate: the tension between mourning kin and other members of a community, the limitation of the female role in lament and death ritual, and the liminality of the unburied and unstable dead before burial. Where grave epigram attempts to balance private and public interests by situating the meaning of the individual death in collectively relevant terms of martial conflict or of a historical or geographic situation, the *Antigone* explores the tension between private and public interests in the character of Creon, for whom Polyneices represents both a relative and an enemy of the state he embodies. The strict epic demarcations between female and male mourning are also complicated in the figure of Antigone, who, as the single surviving and sympathetic relative of Polyneices, must perform male funerary rites in order to satisfy the duties of familial ritual duty for the dead. The chronological strategies of epic as a mediating ritual narration and of epigram as the documentation of completed ritual aim to avoid the liminality of death and the dead; by contrast, the tragedy explores the concept of pollution and liminality inside and outside the city, from the exposure of Polyneices' corpse to the failed sacrifice of Tiresias and the sacrificial suicide of Eurydice. Within the civic setting of the Dionysiac festival, the tragic performance itself represents a safe context within which the audience can explore the range of tensions between civic and domestic priorities inherent in funerary behavior, all of which must be subsumed and moderated by the democratic polis. The oral representation of lament on the tragic stage finally underlines the central role of mourning as necessary private expression regulated and subordinated by the polis, but also a part of the definitive verbal exchange in civic life.

---

149 Knox 100.

150 e.g. the Alcmaeonidae (Hdt. 5.71, Thuc. 1.126.3-11) and Themistocles (Thuc. 1.138.6); see Cerri 20-2.

The purpose of this chapter has been to examine the further trajectory of the genres of lament and grave epigram into the classical period. As seen in the readings above, various traditional themes and issues persist into the classical period, while the available texts reveal an increasing diversification and blurring among funerary genres. Professional lament asserts itself as a poetic genre on a par with other performance genres, characterizing itself as paradigmatic and reciprocal, and even drawing upon sympotic τέρψις imagery. The generic self-assertion of the Pindaric threnos is rooted in its elimination of lament's liminal aspect: it blurs the boundary between life and death by obscuring the fact of death and instead representing the afterlife and the resulting possibilities for reciprocity between living and dead communities. Similarly, the tragic performance constitutes a publicly acceptable representation of lament; while private mourning is portrayed as potentially ambiguous, the Sophoclean *Antigone* views it also as a necessary component of death ritual and as a form of expression analogous to the vital oral exchange within the polis. The classical grave epigram reveals continued developments from those of the archaic and early classical period, including an increasing historicity that encompasses broader information about the deceased's occupation, political belonging, and psychology. Although individually and collectively dedicated grave epigrams such as those at Thermopylae remain associated with traditional and historicizing-nontraditional stances toward the dead respectively, their Herodotean context suggests the interchangeable nature of oral memory and written monuments. In Herodotus' history, the construction of the monument becomes an appropriate and explicit expression of mourning, a feature that is confirmed by the increasing appearance of diction of lament in contemporary epigram.

The rise of writing results neither in a necessarily linear transition from oral to literate preferences nor a polarization between singular oral and written genres that compete to perform the same function. Rather, oral, material, and written memorials develop and co-exist as individual and collective expression by defining their authority in opposition to each other and also in dependence on each other. Synchronically, grave epigram supplements lament and even appropriates some of its expression yet does not attempt to replace its function as an immediate chronological and social mediator at the gravesite; diachronically, different genres of memory serve as interdependent sources of information, as can be seen in Herodotus' presentation of oral and written memorials for Thermopylae. With the rise of alternative genres directly involved in (funeral oration, public monument) or representing (tragedy) death ritual in the civic

sphere, the tensions between alternative media becomes increasingly superimposed upon questions of private and public control of memorialization.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE EPITAPHIOS LOGOS AND MOURNING IN THE ATHENIAN POLIS

The burial of the war dead in the first winter of the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.34-47) reflects the fifth-century dominance of the public memorial and the concurrent rise of the collective burial site, the δημόσιον σῆμα.[1] While often distinguishing the deceased with a verse epigram or a prominent burial site, the public memorial treats the dead in a civic context, within which their individual identity is linked solely to their collective place of death[2] and to their Athenian tribe or their non-Athenian origins.[3] This collective method of burial is reflected in the collectivity of the ritual and oration performed at the gravesite in Thucydides' narrative:

> τὰ μὲν ὀστᾶ προτιθένται [i.e. prothesis] τῶν ἀπογενομένων πρότριτα σκηνὴν ποιήσαντες, καὶ ἐπιφέρει τῷ αὑτοῦ ἕκαστος ἥν τι βουλῆται. ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἡ ἐκφορὰ ᾖ, λάρνακας κυπαρισσίνας ἄγουσιν ἅμαξαι, φυλῆς ἑκάστης μίαν. ἔνεστι δὲ τὰ ὀστᾶ ἧς ἕκαστος ἦν φυλῆς (Thuc. 2.34.2-3).

Although positioned within the frame narrative of the Thucydidean history, the funeral oration of Pericles (Thuc. 2.35-46) reflects the established genre of epitaphios[4], which is rooted in oral presentations passed on in collective Athenian memory and draws on institutional-political and compositional aspects of form and topos that constitute a tradition common to both historical and literary epitaphioi.[5] Therefore, in my discussion

---

[1] The origin and chronology of the δημόσιον σῆμα and the πάτριος νόμος of public burial with the funeral oration is an issue in itself: see C. Clairmont, *Patrios Nomos: Public Burial at Athens During the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B. C.* 2 vols. (Oxford, 1983), Loraux 28ff., 56ff., W. Kendrick Pritchett, 'Burial of Greek War Dead,' in *The Greek State at War* Vol. 4 of 5 (Berkeley, 1971-1985) 94-259, and the more speculative F. Jacoby, 'Patrios Nomos: State Burial in Athens and the Public Cemetary in the Kerameikos,' *JHS* 64 (1944): 37-66.

[2] Bradeen (1969) 148.

[3] Bradeen (1969) 147-150, Loraux 23; the inscriptions on the δημόσιον σῆμα (i.e. the casualty lists) and the funeral oration differ profoundly in that the inscriptions acknowledge the plurality of Athenian society by marking non-Athenian soldiers as such, while the epitaphios assumes the citizenship of the dead (Loraux 35-7).

[4] In the following discussion, I will use the term 'funeral oration' to designate Thucydides' funeral oration of Pericles and the term 'epitaphios' to indicate epitaphios as a genre.

[5] Loraux 10-11.

below, I will refer both to Thucydides' funeral oration of Pericles and to other epitaphioi in isolating the functions of the epitaphios and its relationship to the other genres present at the gravesite.

Our evidence for the epitaphios comes from a range of fifth- and fourth-century texts, most of which display singular characteristics that complicate or qualify their use in a discussion of the commonalities of epitaphioi as a genre.[6] These texts include: secondary sources for Pericles' funeral oration (Arist. *Rhet.* 1411a, Plut. *Pericles* 8.6), Thucydides' representation of Pericles' funeral oration (Thuc. 2.35-46), fragments of Gorgias' funeral oration (DK 82B5a-6), Lysias 2, Plato's epitaphios of Aspasia communicated through Socrates (*Menexenus* 236d-249c), Demosthenes 60, and Hyperides 6. While the evidence for Pericles' original epitaphios of Samos is indirect and scanty, Thucydides' representation of Pericles' funeral oration remains part of the larger frame narrative of the *History* and thus raises questions about its relationship with the epitaphios in performance.[7] Despite Thucydides' aim to reconstruct historical speeches with accuracy (1.22.1) and the presence of an historical epitaphios of Pericles, many scholars have argued that the funeral oration was composed either as an oration in defense of Athens after 404 BCE[8] or as a fictive oration that straddles the aims of the Thucydidean history and the usual generic functions of the epitaphios. Various features of the funeral oration of Pericles align themselves with the goals of Thucydides' history. The contrast between the ideals of the funeral oration and the reality of the Athenian plague that follows (2.47.2-54) suggests the importance of the oration as a constituent of Thucydides' larger historical narrative[9]; similarly, the history's aspiration to be a narrative κτῆμα...ἐς αἰεί (1.22.4)

---

[6] See Loraux 8-12.

[7] While Rusten (J. Rusten, ed., *Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War Book II* (Cambridge, 1989)) sees the funeral oration as distinct from other epitaphioi in its greater concentration on contemporary rather than historical Athens (19), he does cite various commonalities between the funeral oration and other epitaphioi: praise of the ancestors and the fallen, exhortation to the citizens, and consolation of the relatives (135).

[8] J. Th. Kakridis, *Der thukydideische Epitaphios* [Zetemata 26] (Munich, 1961); cf. A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, Books II-III* (Vol. II) (Oxford, 1956) 104, 126-130, 136 on several passages in the funeral oration that illustrate the particular problems in attaching the oration to Pericles or to Thucydides as its author; while the speech captures the mood and ideology of 431 BCE, it also appears to be aware of the outcome of 404 BCE.

[9] See K. Gaiser, *Das Staatsmodel des Thukydides. Zur Rede des Perikles für die Gefallenen* (Heidelberg, 1975) 51-60 on the funeral oration's place in Thucydides' history as a paradigm of the ideal Athens that stands as a foil for its reality, which is embodied by the contrasting scenes of the plague that follow and by the city's decline throughout the remaining narrative.

appears to parallel the funeral oration's goal of making its λόγος into a durable ἔργον, as I will demonstrate below. Yet, as with any literary representation of a performance genre, the funeral oration necessarily possesses formal and thematic features that lie within the acceptable alternatives that circumscribe the historical performances of the epitaphios and that allow us to treat it in parallel with other historical epitaphioi.[10]

Lysias 2 and the few fragments of Gorgias' epitaphios are also complicated with respect to their performance context, since, as non-citizens, both authors could not have delivered their speeches in Athens; similarly, Plato's portrayal of Socrates quoting Aspasia's epitaphios calls the accuracy of his representation into question. Demosthenes' epitaphios includes various mythological inaccuracies and echoes of other authors that likewise provoke doubts about his authorship of the text. Beyond these scholarly quandaries specific to the individual texts, the predominance of fictitious copies or representations of the epitaphios remains problematic. Nevertheless, Loraux delivers a cogent critique of the isolated scholarship on each text in sole relationship with its author rather than with the genre of the epitaphios. Her attention to both real and literary epitaphioi as prototypes of a national language that are transmitted orally in individual and collective memory yields the possibility of understanding the conventions of the epitaphios as a literary-performative genre and as a civic institution, which in turn influences other types of discourse within the Athenian polis.[11]

While Loraux argues that scholarship should consider the significance of the epitaphios' conventions in context (11), her discussion treats the relationship between the epitaphios and other genres of mourning or representations of mourning only in passing, mainly to characterize the agonistic position of the epitaphios against lament, grave epigram, and prior poetic genres.[12] Loraux characterizes the epitaphios as a supplementary civic genre opposed to the speech-dialogue which is inevitably related to human action:

> 'Delivered in Athens, where the "speech-dialogue" persisted, it [the epitaphios] nevertheless has nothing to do with any decision or deliberation, but follows action instead of preceding it and seems quite willing to present itself as a mere supplement (236).'

---

[10] Cf. the similar conclusions of Rusten *Thucydides* 16-17 and Loraux 10-11, who argues that the Thucydidean funeral oration of Pericles and the *Menexenus* epitaphios, despite their nature as fictive orations serving the larger purposes of a historical or philosophical text, necessarily reflect the conventions of the epitaphios.

[11] Loraux 10-11.

[12] Loraux 24, 44-50, 54-5, 201.

Based on my discussion of the epitaphios below, the genre is indeed supplementary to the lament and the epigram, in that it aspires to unite λόγος and ἔργον in an oral performance for the first time; this unification of speech and actuality is rooted in the epitaphios' association of its project with the action-oriented verbal exchange of the polis and in the epitaphios' position both following death as action and preceding the active response of the polis in caring for the survivors of the dead. As I will argue below, the epitaphios represents one endpoint of the development of civic strategies of commemoration in the Athenian polis; it functions as an independent genre that supplements, appropriates, and challenges existing media of mourning, such as the private ritual lament and the inscribed monument. The core functions of lament as ritual mediation and of grave epigram as an inscriptional record allow the epitaphios to allude to their presence, while also subordinating them to its own larger narrative. The epitaphios engages in an agon against lament and epigram with their inherent temporal and spatial limits; it obscures the individual death in a historical narrative that functions as praise and in which individual lives are subordinated to the temporal continuity and geographical ubiquity of the polis. In its strategy of self-legitimation over against lament and the epigram, the epitaphia assimilates itself to the definitive role of speech in the Athenian polis and redefines death ritual in the civic context as the midpoint between the crisis of death and the continued reciprocal relationship between the polis and its citizens.

For Thucydides, the epitaphios logos represents a particularly Athenian development among the genres of speech about the dead (Ἀθηναῖοι τῷ πατρίῳ νόμῳ χρώμενοι, 2.34.1); however, to avoid Athenocentrism[13], it is necessary to qualify this assertion by noting that any possible epitaphioi logoi from other poleis are lost to us, and that any conclusions about the progress of literacy and of genres of mourning in this chapter are limited to Athens alone. Although the epitaphios is not documented in poleis out-

[13] Recent literature has begun to draw attention to the issue of Athenocentrism and the need for scholarly focus on other poleis (e.g. T. H. van Andel and C. Runnels, *Beyond the Acropolis: A Rural Greek Past* (New York, 1987); Hans-Joachim Gehrke, *Jenseits von Athen und Sparta: Das dritte Griechenland und seine Staatenwelt* (Munich, 1986)); any discussion of diachronic change in Greece must take the (typical or exceptional?) position of Athens into account. In treating the archaic funerary monuments, I have based my argument on texts from throughout Greece that share many commonalities because of their similarity of function; while the epitaphios appears to be a development peculiar to Athens according to our sources, it still provides one well-documented case that yields some productive, if not absolute, hypotheses about the trajectory of literacy and funerary genres in Greece.

side Athens, Loraux notes that the epitaphios possesses 'a profound link with the mental world of the "classical" Greek city, in which the primacy of public values was both a reality and an ideal' (42); she thus suggests that the Athenian epitaphioi reflect larger trends common to the Greek poleis, where the restrictions on lament represent a replacement of mourning with praise and (historical) memory analogical to the project of the epitaphios itself (44). While increased civic control of private monuments leads to the predominance of the public memorial in Athens from the late sixth to the late fifth century BCE, private epigrams continue to develop in the other classical poleis. Athens represents an exceptional case in the marked limitations on private funerary expression and in the apparently unique development of the epitaphios, yet it also remains representative in its institution of funeral regulations and in its expression of public ideology common to many Greek cities. The epitaphios thus embodies one particular, if only better documented, trajectory of oral and literate genres of memory in Greece. The epitaphios simultaneously reveals the increasing relevance of private mourning in the polis and the non-linear evolution of literacy in the agglomeration of multiple, mutually exclusive oral and literate texts for the same occasion and in the development of the epitaphios as an oral performance that encompasses the meaning of prior oral, material, and written genres.

4.1 *The Epitaphios as an Agonistic Genre*

The epitaphios logos is a genre defined by its topoi, which are prescribed by the civic nomos of its performance and thus both limit its scope and provide it with traditional material which can be adapted into innovative usages in individual epitaphioi.[14] Each epitaphios is agonistic both politically and generically, in that it asserts Athens' uniqueness among the poleis as well as its own generic primacy over prior epitaphioi, the poetic tradition, and other traditional forms of mourning, including lament and the funerary monument.[15] As a civic genre, the epitaphios' structure and

---

[14] Loraux 222-3, 228, 238-251. Cf. Loraux 251, 290-6 on the epitaphios as based on civic topoi which simultaneously determine its structural boundaries and its material; the frame narrative of Thucydides' history both resonates with and challenges these topoi, suggesting the interpenetration of Athenian speech about Athens and the topoi used in Pericles' funeral oration.

[15] Loraux 50, 215-7, 240-3, H. Strasburger, 'Thukydides und die politische Selbstdarstellung der Athener,' *Hermes* 86 (1958): 17-40, esp. 34-5.

topoi avoid individual motifs while focusing on the primacy of the city; its political agon is intermeshed with formal expressions of its collective emphasis, such as the generalized nature of its historical narrative and the anonymity of the speaker and the deceased.[16] Yet the epitaphios also occupies an ambiguous situation as a relatively new prose genre, as a written genre performed in an oral context, and as a genre dealing with death. This is reflected in the epitaphios' ambiguous agon with oral traditions; while it rejects the liminality of ritual lament and the functions of other prior performative genres, the epitaphios also buttresses its position as oral genre through association with civic speech. Situated within the context of burial, the epitaphios takes its generic identity from its situation as a speech carried out at the gravesite (ἐπιτάφιος)[17] while it often attempts to override the significance of the inscribed monument by emphasizing the reification of Athenian ideals in its own narrative and in civic life. With its dependence on the pre-existence of lament and epigram and in its new position as prose genre in a civic setting, the epitaphios lies between various alternative media of mourning in the traditional divide between the verbal and the material memorial.[18]

Despite its agonistic position toward other oral, written, and material media, the epitaphios displays various thematic continuities with all of the media that precede it: the beautiful death and the analogical aesthetics of the memorial, the concern with an active response to death (in particular the λόγος -ἔργον opposition), the concept of death as departure, the public address to all groups within the polis (ἀστῶν καὶ ξένων Thuc. 2.36.4), and chronological motifs. Each of these topoi of lament or epigram is transformed into a part of the Athenian civic history, thus displaying the function of innovation on set themes that is the definitive characteristic of the epitaphios. In the funeral oration, the citizens' death in martial activity, their funeral customs, and their general civic character is associated with

[16] Loraux 52, 77, 86, Strasburger 28-9.

[17] The epitaphios generally acknowledges the presence of the gravesite at the outset of the speech: τὰς τίμας, οἷα κα νῦν περὶ τὸν τάφον τόνδε δημοσίαι παρασκευασθέντα ὁρᾶτε (Thuc. 2.35.1); τοὺς ἐν τῷδε τῷ τάφῳ κειμένους (Demosth. 60.1); τὸν ἐροῦντ' ἐπὶ ταῖς δημοσίαις τάφαις (Demosth. 60.2, cf. 33); ἐπὶ τῷδε τῷ τάφῳ (Hyperides 6.1); ὦ πάροντες ἐπὶ τῷδε τῷ τάφῳ (Lysias 2.1), ἀνθ' ὧν ἡ πόλις αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐπένθησε καὶ ἔθαψε δημοσίαι (2.66); ἐν τῷδε τῷ μνήματι τιμηθέντες (Plato *Menexenus* 242c). In one fragment, Gorgias' funeral oration focuses on the interconnection of the monument with oral performances, in that Greek war trophies over the barbarians call for song, while barbarian trophies over the Greeks call for laments: τὰ μὲν κατὰ τῶν βαρβάρων τρόπαια ὕμνους ἀπαιτεῖ τὰ δὲ κατὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων θρήνους.

[18] Loraux 231-240; on these topoi, see Kakridis 2-5.

beauty.[19] Through this parallel between the agency of the warriors, Athenian custom, and the civic character, the epitaphios connects the traditional epic celebration of the beautiful death and the epigrams' analogy between the beautiful death and the beautiful monument to the overarching civic framework which unites them and makes them possible.[20] Similarly, the traditional tension between passive verbal and active material commemoration of the dead is resolved by the epitaphios, which bridges λόγος and ἔργον through its interrelationship of speech and action in the identity of the polis and its commemoration of the dead, as I will show below.

In the epitaphios, various traditional tropes, such as the concept of death as departure, are re-configured to become part of the epitaphios' account of the history and character of the polis; for example, the departure of the dead from the survivors (τοὺς... λοιπούς 43.1, τοῖς λειπομένοις 46) is made equivalent to a passage of the polis from generation to generation, obscuring the loss of individuals: ὅσην ἔχομεν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἀπόνως ἡμῖν τοῖς νῦν προσκατέλιπον (Thuc. 2.36.2–3). Other epitaphioi likewise associate the legacies of speech, action, and memory with the departure of the past ancestors and the present dead rather than focusing on the traditional theme of death as a departure from surviving relatives:

> οἱ δ' ἡμέτεροι πρόγονοι οὐ λογισμῷ εἰδότες τοὺς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ κινδύνους, ἀλλὰ νομίζοντες τὸν εὐκλεᾶ θάνατον ἀθάνατον περὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν καταλείπειν λόγον... (Lysias 2.23).[21]

Similarly, the chronological motifs typical in our evidence for lament reappear in epitaphios, where time remains connected to the contrasts between life and death:

> ὥσπερ Περικλῆς ἔφη τὴν νεότητα τὴν ἀπολομένην ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ οὕτως ἠφανίσαι ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὥσπερ εἴ τις τὸ ἔαρ ἐκ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐξέλοι (Aristotle *Rhet.* 1411a)[22]

---

[19] For the theme of beauty attributed to the citizens' death: κινδύνων ἅμα τόνδε κάλλιστον νομίσαντες 42.4, κάλλιστον δὲ ἔρανον αὐτῇ προιέμενοι 43.2. For the Athenian funerary customs as beautiful: τὸ δημόσιον σῆμα, ὅ ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοῦ καλλίστου προαστείου τῆς πόλεως 34.5; τὸν λόγον τόνδε, ὡς καλὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐκ τῶν πολέμων θαπτομένοις ἀγορεύσθαι αὐτόν 35.1. On the civic character as connected with beauty: φιλοκαλοῦμεν, 40.1.

[20] cf. Demosthenes 60.1, 4, 8, 26-7, 31, 37; Hyperides 6.26-7; Lysias 2.2, 20, 42, 47, 55, 65, 70, 79; Plato *Men.* 234c-235c, 246d-e.

[21] Cf. Lysias 2.2, 24, 81; Demosth. 60.1, 32; Hyperides 6.32-3, 41-2.

[22] Cf. chronological motifs in the γόοι, such as the theme of alternating days and nights: *Il.* 22.432 [Hecabe], 24.744-5 [Andromache].

The metaphor spring : year :: youth : polis develops away from traditional usages as we have seen them above; rather than describing the duration of lament or a simple contrast between life and death of the individual, the metaphor appropriates the value of the youth as part of the value of the polis, an especially meaningful strategy considering the extraordinary importance of the youthful death in archaic memorials. In its appropriation and transformation of traditional themes, the epitaphios displays a concerted strategy of obscuring the individual death and displacing the traditions of individual mourning onto its legimitization of its own generic authority and the political primacy of the polis.

The epitaphios' claim to priority over private mourning is buttressed both by its redefinition of traditional topoi of lament and grave epigram as well as by its agonistic references to other forms of memorialization. Epitaphios renders poetic memorialization unnecessary, in that the persistent memory and effectiveness of Athenian daring extends beyond the immediate τέρψις of epic praise:

> οὐδὲν προσδεόμενοι οὔτε Ὁμήρου ἐπαινέτου οὔτε ὅστις ἔπεσι μὲν τὸ αὐτίκα τέρψει, τῶν δ' ἔργων τὴν ὑπόνοιαν ἡ ἀλήθεια βλάψει, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν μὲν θάλασσαν καὶ γῆν ἐσβατὸν τῇ ἡμετέραι τόλμηι καταναγκάσαντες γενέσθαι, πανταχοῦ δὲ μνημεῖα κακῶν τε κἀγαθῶν ἀίδια ξυγκατοικίσαντες (Thuc. 2.41.4).

This passage explicitly rejects the notion of τέρψις and poetic memorialization as the genres of memory traditionally contrasted with lament. By contrast, institutionalized τέρψις to dispel sadness resides in the self-sufficient polis: ἀγῶσι μέν γε καὶ θυσίαις διετησίοις νομίζοντες, ἰδίαις δὲ κατασκευαῖς εὐπρεπέσιν, ὧν καθ' ἡμέραν ἡ τέρψις τὸ λυπηρὸν ἐκπλήσσει (Thuc. 2.38.1-2). While the opposition between τέρψις and mourning recalls the traditional tensions between pleasure and mourning found in epic and elegy[23], here the location of τέρψις within the state displaces individual grief through collective civic activity, thus eliminating the need for lament as well as epic praise or poetic pleasure.

Like the Thucydidean funeral oration, Demosthenes' epitaphios establishes its generic authority over against that of prior poetic and historiographic memory. By focusing on contemporary events not covered by poetry and prior historiography, the epitaphios extends and canonizes

---

[23] As shown above in Chapter 2, while the verb τέρπεσθαι is used of the completed γόος in Homer (*Od.* 4.102 [Menelaus], 194 [Peisistratos], 11.212 [Odysseus and his mother in Hades], 19.213, 251, 513, 21.57 [Penelope]), elegy contrasts the τέρψις of its own pleasurable song with lament (Archil. 11, 13.1-2, 215W).

those deeds that are worthy of memory and poetic or historiographic attention; Demosthenes' epitaphios transmits memory from the event to poetry and history, which are thus rendered derivative genres:

> τῶν μὲν οὖν εἰς μύθους ἀνενηνεγμένων ἔργων πολλὰ παραλιπὼν τούτων ἐπεμνήσθην ὧν οὕτως ἕκαστον εὐσχήμονας καὶ πολλοὺς ἔχει λογοὺς, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς ἐμμέτρους καὶ τοὺς τῶν ᾀδομένων ποιητὰς καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν συγγραφέων ὑποθέσεις τἀκείνων ἔργα τῆς αὑτῶν μουσικῆς πεποιῆσθαι. ἃ δὲ τῇ μὲν ἀξίᾳ τῶν ἔργων οὐδέν ἐστι τούτων ἐλάττω, τῷ δ' ὑπογυιότερ' εἶναι τοῖς χρόνοις οὔπω μεμυθολόγηται οὐδ' εἰς τὴν ἡρωϊκὴν ἐπανῆκται τάξιν, ταῦτα ἤδη λέξω. (Demosth. 60.9-10)

Similarly, the *Menexenus* differentiates its historical material as appropriate for prose in that it has not yet been treated by poetry (239b-c); the epitaphios provides an impetus to translate its narrative into poetry, thus again appropriating poetic material with a praeteritio while also imagining poetry as dependent on the material thematized by epitaphios: τούτων πέρι μοι δοκεῖ χρῆναι ἐπιμνησθῆναι ἐπαινοῦντα τε καὶ προμνώμενον ἄλλοις ἐς ᾠδάς τε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ποίησιν αὐτὰ θεῖναι πρεπόντως τῶν πραξάντων (239c). With its ambiguous position between an agonistic rejection of the poetic tradition and an appropriation of poetic functions[24], the epitaphios demonstrates its simultaneous dependence on the pre-existence of poetic models of expression and on its own self-definition through the rejection and subordination of these models to its own narrative.

In dismantling the traditional opposition between epic and lament as rival poetic genres, the funeral oration also defines itself in opposition to lament. Within the civic ceremony, the communal transportation, prothesis, ekphora, burial, and inscription for the war dead practically eliminate private participation in death ritual and leave room only for women's agency in lament. The integration of familial ritual and lament into the public ceremony minimizes the role of female mourning; the lament is explicitly incorporated into the civic ceremony yet remains recognizable both in the speech's agon against lament and in the conventional final dismissal of the relatives to complete their private mourning.[25] In most epi-

---

[24] Beyond the question of τέρψις, note the use of ὑμνεῖν for the speaker's activity, used elsewhere of poets (1.21.2): τὴν πόλιν ὕμνησα (2.42.2); cf. also Lysias 2.2-3 (ὑμνοῦσι... ὑμνοῦντας). See Gomme 131.

[25] οὐκ ὀλοφύρομαι μᾶλλον ἢ παραμυθήσομαι (Thuc. 2.44.1); νῦν δὲ ἀπολοφυρόμενοι ὃν προσήκει ἑκάστῳ ἄπιτε (Thuc. 2.46.2-47.1); τὰ τῆς πατρίδος πράγματα ἔρημα καὶ δακρύων καὶ πένθους πλήρη (Demosth. 60.32); ὑμεῖς δ' ἀποδυρόμενοι καὶ τὰ προσήκονθ' ὡς χρὴ καὶ νόμιμα ποιήσαντες ἄπιτε (Demosth. 60.37); εἰ γὰρ θρήνων ἄξια πεπόνθασιν, ἀλλ' ἐπαίνων μεγάλων πεποιήκασιν (Hyperides 6.42); ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἐξήχθην ὑπὲρ πάσης ὀλοφύρασθαι τῆς Ἑλλάδος (Lysias 2.61); θεραπεύοντας τὸν πάτριον νόμον ὀλοφύρεσθαι τούς θαπτομένους

taphioi, the orator questions the necessity or the effectiveness of lament at some point in the speech; the Thucydidean funeral oration of Pericles is the only epitaphios where women are also specifically addressed regarding their mourning and other potentially divisive behaviors at the funeral.[26] This advice to women extends the funeral oration's general negotiation between private and public life to address the wives' new status as publicly recognized war widows, which gives men's speech about them a public significance; the adhortation to the widows constitutes one part of the polis' appropriation of familial funeral ritual and responses to death, which includes measures ranging from the public and collective burial to the polis' upbringing of war orphans to Pericles' stance as an advising κύριος for the widows.[27] The funeral oration dismisses women's role as mourners through the absence of any positive role of women in the mourning process, together with the suggestion that the wife's μεγάλη δόξα of social invisibility parallels the κλέος of her husband's deeds:

> τῆς τε γὰρ ὑπαρχούσης φύσεως μὴ χείροσι γενέσθαι ὑμῖν μεγάλη ἡ δόξα, καὶ ἧς ἂν ἐπ' ἐλάχιστον ἀρετῆς πέρι ἢ ψόγου ἐν τοῖς ἄρσεσι κλέος ᾖ (Thuc. 2.45.2).[28]

This κλέος of women's silence and men's silence about women at once parallels and opposes the male κλέος traditionally celebrated by speech. The only mention of κλέος in the funeral oration is in this passage and at Thuc. 2.37.1, where καλεῖσθαι alludes to κλέος, much as in the Phrasikleia epigram (CEG 24): καὶ ὄνομα μὲν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐς ὀλίγους ἀλλ' ἐς πλείονας οἰκεῖν δημοκρατία κέκληται. By attributing κλέος to women's silence,

---

(Lysias 2.81); νῦν δὲ ἤδη ὑμεῖς τε καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες κοινῇ κατὰ τὸν νόμον τοὺς τετελευτηκότας ἀπολοφυράμενοι ἄπιτε (Plato *Menexenus* 249c, cf. 247c, 248b-c).

[26] See Lorna Hardwick, 'Philomel and Pericles: silence in the funeral speech,' *G&R* 40 (1993): 147-162 on the control of the widows' behavior and in particular men's speech about them because of their position as newly marriageable women and as mourners who could inspire rivalries among the survivors; these divisive tendencies are addressed by the epitaphios' prescriptions to minimize disruptive female behavior, male speech about women, and the potentially resulting rivalries within the civic occasion.

[27] Lisa Kallet-Marx, 'Thuc. 2.45.2 and the status of war widows in Periclean Athens,' in R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell, eds., *Nomodeiktes: Studies in honor of M. Ostwald* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1993): 133-143, esp. 139-140.

[28] Holst-Warhaft 121, Rusten *Thucydides* 175-6. For further discussions of this passage within the context of Thucydidean history and of contemporary Athenian society, cf. also David Schaps, 'The woman least mentioned,' *CQ* 27 (1977): 323-330 on the general limitations of publicly naming women in classical Athens as well as T. J. Wiedemann, 'ἐλάχιστον... ἐν τοῖς ἄρσεσι κλέος: Thucydides, women and the limits of rational analysis,' *G&R* 30 (1983): 163-170 on the status of women in the Thucydidean history as outside the sphere of normal political and military conflict in Greece and thus as associated with distant cultures and (mythic) times, as well as with chance happenings.

men's silence about women, and the name of democracy, the funeral oration shifts attention away from the individual expression of women and men to the collective singular δημοκρατία, whose etymology and character is defined by its accommodation of the many. Thus, rather than mourning with the individual survivors of the dead, the speaker adopts a counseling stance that obscures the fact of past death and highlights the representation of the dead and their action as paradigmatic for the present: Δι' ὅπερ καὶ τοὺς τῶνδε νῦν τοκέας, ὅσοι πάρεστε, οὐκ ὀλοφύρομαι μᾶλλον ἢ παραμυθήσομαι... (Thuc. 2.44.1).[29] Here, Pericles associates his parainetic stance first and foremost with the parents of dead children, the traditional extraordinary death which was preferentially marked by writing in grave epigrams of the archaic period; in doing so, he universalizes the shift from mourning to paradigmatic behavior for all groups in the polis who are in less extraordinary situations, such as the peers, siblings and womenfolk of the dead, for whom appropriate directions follow.

The other epitaphioi share similar strategies of displacing the private lament by questioning its validity in the civic sphere and by recapitulating traditional themes of the uselessness of lament or the inevitability of death; conversely, the epitaphioi never fully deny the presence and necessity of the private lament, which, as we have seen in Chapter 3, comes to be represented as a part of the definitive verbal exchange of the classical polis. Lysias' funeral oration explicitly acknowledges the necessity of both private and public memory (ἐκείνων δὲ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἄξιον καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ δημοσίᾳ μεμνῆσθαι, 2.61) as well as lament and the inscribed monument as reactions to death:

> ὥστ' ἄξιον τοῖς ζῶσι τούτους ποθεῖν καὶ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ὀλοφύρεσθαι καὶ τοὺς προσήκοντας αὐτῶν ἐλεεῖν τοῦ ἐπιλοίπου βίου... (Lysias 2.71)

> ὥστ' ἄξιον ἦν ἐπὶ τῷδε τῷ τάφῳ τότε κείρασθαι τῇ Ἑλλάδι καὶ πενθῆσαι τοὺς ἐνθάδε κειμένους... (Lysias 2.60).

Yet, while acknowledging the lament and the epigram, Lysias' epitaphios argues for the greater importance of its own narration as an historical paradigm:

> ἐκείνοις μὲν οὖν οὕτω διακειμένοις ὁ βίος οἰκτρος καὶ ὁ θάνατος εὐκτός· οὗτοι δὲ καὶ ζῶντες καὶ ἀποθανόντες ζηλωτοί, παιδευθέντες μὲν ἐν τοῖς τῶν προγόνων ἀγαθοῖς, ἄνδρες δὲ γενόμενοι τήν τε ἐκείνων δόξαν διασώσαντες καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν ἀρετὴν ἐπιδείξαντες (Lysias 2.69).

---

[29] Gaiser 25.

Finally, in the universal context of human mortality, the exemplary death in war is hardly to be mourned: ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι δεῖ τοιαῦτα ὀλοφύρεσθαι. οὐ γὰρ ἐλανθάνομεν ἡμας αὐτοὺς ὄντες θνητοί (Lysias 2.77); similarly, the epitaphios of Hyperides shifts the emphasis away from lament to praise, which memorializes the ἀρετή and agency of the warriors rather than their death:

> χρὴ... μεμνῆσθαι μὴ μόνον τοῦ θανάτου τῶν τετελευτηκότων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἧς καταλελοίπασιν. εἰ γὰρ θρήνων ἄξια πεπόνθασιν, ἀλλ' ἐπαίνων μεγάλων πεποιήκασιν... (6.41).

Here, lament becomes associated with the passive suffering of the dead (πεπόνθασιν) and is opposed to the laudatory epitaphios, which focuses on the warriors' actions (πεποιήκασιν). While concluding with the canonical dismissal to lament (249c), Plato's *Menexenus* also discourages lament in favor of praise, which simultaneously acknowledges human mortality and the exemplary accomplishments of the deceased:

> πατέρας δὲ ἡμῶν, οἷς εἰσί, καὶ μητέρας ἀεὶ χρὴ παραμυθεῖσθαι ὡς ῥᾷστα φέρειν τὴν ξυμφοράν, ἐὰν ἄρα ξυμβῇ γενέσθαι, καὶ μὴ ξυνοδύρεσθαι...οὐ γὰρ ἀθανάτους σφίσι παῖδας εὔχοντο γενέσθαι ἀλλ' ἀγαθοὺς καὶ εὐκλεεῖς (247c-d).

> ὥστε πρέπει αὐτὰ μᾶλλον κοσμεῖν ἢ θρηνεῖν γυναικῶν δὲ τῶν ἡμετέρων καὶ παιδῶν ἐπιμελούμενοι καὶ τρέφοντες... (248c).

The *Menexenus* thus views lament neither as a constructive activity nor as reciprocity that results in χάρις: οὐ θρηνοῦντες οὐδὲ ὀλοφυράμενοι ἡμὰς ἡμῖν μάλιστα χαριοῦνται 248b); instead, the orator privileges praise and the citizens' active engagement for the survivors of the dead, which represent the typically civic speech and action in response to death. While Demosthenes' epitaphios characteristically acknowledges the necessity of mourning, the existence of a good reputation shaped by the epitaphios makes mourning obsolete by perpetuating the memory of the deceased that serves as the basis for reciprocity between the city and the survivors:

> τὸν ἄπαντ' εὔκλειαν ἀγηρω καταλείπουσιν, ἐν ᾗ καὶ παῖδες οἱ τούτων ὀνομαστοὶ τραφήσονται, καὶ γονεῖς οἱ τούτων περίβλεπτοι γηροτροφήσονται, παραψυχὴν τῷ πένθει τὴν τούτων εὔκλειαν ἔχοντες (60.32-3).

Both here and in the Platonic epitaphios of Aspasia, the praise of the dead is understood as κλέος:

> παραψυχὴν τῷ πένθει τὴν τούτων εὔκλειαν (Demosth. 60.32-3)
> οὐ γὰρ ἀθανάτους σφίσι παῖδας εὔχοντο γενέσθαι ἀλλ' ἀγαθοὺς καὶ εὐκλεεῖς (Plato *Men.* 247c-d)

Yet this κλέος functions less to distinguish the individual as in the Homeric γόοι or in the archaic epigrams (CEG 24) than to substantiate the connection between public dialogue about individual accomplishment and the ongoing reciprocity between the citizens and the survivors. In the epitaphios' agon with lament, the characteristic functions of lament as a genre of memory are displaced by this praise and by the historical narrative that override the potential divisiveness of private mourning to perpetuate collective reciprocity within the polis.

The epitaphios also engages in an agon with the material monument; the public monument to the dead represents an active construction in honor of the dead which the funeral oration claims to match by reifying the honors of the deceased in analogy to the τάφος:

> ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρκοῦν ἂν ἔδοκει εἶναι ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργῳ γενομένων ἔργῳ καὶ δηλοῦσθαι τὰς τίμας, οἶα καὶ νῦν περὶ τὸν τάφον τόνδε δημοσίαι παρασκευασθέντα ὁρᾶτε... (Thuc. 2.35.1).

Througout the epitaphios, the speaker uses diction that suggests the oration's reification of the warriors' ἔργα, with special emphasis on the visible aspects of the memorial for the dead and on vocabulary of sight and signification (especially δηλοῦν[30]):

> ὁ δὲ Στησίμβροτός φησιν [Pericles] ὅτι τοὺς ἐν Σάμῳ τεθνηκότας ἐγκωμιάζων ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἀθανάτους ἔλεγε γεγονέναι καθάπερ τοὺς θεοὺς. οὐ γὰρ ἐκείνους αὐτοὺς ὁρῶμεν, ἀλλὰ ταῖς τιμαῖς ἃς ἔχουσι, καὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἃ παρέχουσιν, ἀθανάτους εἶναι τεκμαιρόμεθα. (Plutarch *Pericles* 8)

The speaker's project of reifying the deeds of the deceased is buttressed by his citation of outsiders' perception of Athenian success:

> μετὰ μεγάλων δὲ σημείων[31] καί οὐ δή τοι ἀμάρτυρόν γε τὴν δύναμιν παρασχόμενοι τοῖς τε νῦν καὶ τοῖς ἔπειτα θαυμασθησόμεσθα (Thuc. 2.41.4).

---

[30] δηλοῦσθαι τὰς τίμας (2.35.1), cf. δηλοῦσθαι 35.2, δηλώσας 36.4, δηλοῦν... ἀρετὴν (42.2); τὴν εὐλογίαν... φανερὰν σημείοις καθιστάς (42.1), πεπραγμένα τοῖς ἀνδράσι *δηλοῦν* (Demosth. 60.13); οὐ ῥᾳδιον... τὰ ἐν ἅπαντι τῷ χρόνῳ πραχθέντα ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ *δηλωθῆναι... μηνῦσαι* (Lysias 2.54); ὡς οὖν ἐν καλῇ πολιτείᾳ ἐτραφήσαν... ἀναγκαῖον *δηλῶσαι* (Plato *Men.* 238c) etc.; see Lowell Edmunds, 'Thucydides in the Act of Writing,' Roberto Pretagostini, ed., *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all' eta ellenistica: Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili* II (Rome, 1993): 848 and n. 52 on Thucydides' own use of δηλοῦν in the Archaeology to describe his methodology as opposed to the obscurity of the logographers (1.21.1-2; cf. 1.3.1, 5.2, 9.1, 10.4, 11.1-2, 13.5). Cf. Gaiser 30.

[31] These signs consist of the deeds that make the singular polis of Athens into the παίδευσις of Greece and each of its citizens into an exemplar of Athenian autarchy, as discussed in the passage immediately preceding (2.41.1-4); successive generations observe

Yet, despite this project of reification, the epitaphios lacks the specificity of the individual epigram about names and historical or geographical details and so simultaneously avoids replicating the function of the grave epigram as record and transcends its specific associations with particular individuals, generations, or locations. Thus, while the epitaphios assimilates its own speech to the material monument by reifying the significance of the deceased, it also avoids localization through its universalizing history in which many analogous ἔργα are fused in the single ἔργον of the epitaphios. This simultaneous acknowledgment and subordination of poetry, lament, and epigram within the epitaphios does not involve an absolute rejection of these media but a system in which the broader generic, historic, and civic goals of the epitaphios are founded on the pre-existence and the appropriation of these media.

The funeral oration recognizes its place within the context of funeral ritual following mourning and burial, and acknowledges the presence of mourners engaged in private lament (ἀπολοφυράμενοι ὃν προσήκει ἑκάστῳ, Thuc. 2.46.2) as well as the presence of the inscribed gravemarker (Thuc. 2.43.3); individual death is celebrated and preserved through lament and inscriptions, which mark the ritual passage from life to death and ensure the preservation of the individual's name and identity, respectively. Based on the presence of these media, the epitaphios can extend to a treatment of the collective history of the Athenians as a memorial in itself, and the memory of history becomes the collective honor of the deceased:

> ἄρξομαι δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν προγόνων πρῶτον· δίκαιον γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ πρέπον δὲ ἅμα ἐν τῷ τοιῷδε τὴν τίμην ταύτην τῆς μνήμης δίδοσθαι (Thuc. 2.36.1).

It is the presence of the private media of mourning, whose definitive attributes are both explicitly rejected and yet appropriated by the epitaphios, that also allow the practical functioning of the topoi that define the epitaphios as civic genre. For example, the characteristic anonymity of the speaker and the deceased is enabled by the presence of the inscribed gravemarker, while the universalization of individual memory within civic speech bases itself on the pre-existence of private laments for each individual. Underpinned by the completion of ritual and the inscription of the names of the deceased, the epitaphios functions as a civic medium superimposed over the various private expressions of grief; its

---

and thus substantiate the power of Athens and the civic character which gives rise to it. The need for Homeric or praise poetry is displaced by this reification of Athenian power in the persons of those who recognize it and reproduce this paradigm.

performative authority is derived from its simultaneous rejection and appropriation of other oral and written media through which it reconstitutes the history of the polis in the aftermath of the warriors' death.

4.2 *The Epitaphios and History as Praise and Paradigm*

The performance of the epitaphios is politically conditioned, from the choice of its speaker (ἀνὴρ ἡιρημένος ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως Thuc. 2.34.6) and its function as an oral history in a 'lay' prose format to its praise of past and present Athenians, which concludes with adhortations to the citizen audience.[32] The context of the epitaphios within public funerary ritual emphasizes the role of the state in preparation of the gravesite (Thuc. 2.34.1, 5, 35.1) and the crucial role of the state in the private sphere of the survivors as the educator of orphans (2.46.1). The oration also legitimates Athenian hegemony through its conscious use of historical and contemporary precedents for the activity of the individual citizen and of the polis as a whole before a mixed audience of citizens and foreigners:

> ταῦτα δηλώσας πρῶτον εἶμι ἐπὶ τὸν τῶνδε ἔπαινον, νομίζων ἐπί τε τῶι παρόντι οὐκ ἂν ἀπρεπῆ λεχθῆναι αὐτὰ καί τὸν πάντα ὅμιλον καὶ ἀστῶν καὶ ξένων ξύμφορον εἶναι ἐπακοῦσαι αὐτῶν (Thuc. 2.36.4).[33]

In the epitaphios, individual sacrifices of the warriors for the state, the customs of the Athenians, and the relationship between the citizens and their polis over time form a history that contextualizes the immediate deaths of the warriors within a diachronic narrative.

By reconfiguring these deaths as active per se and as part of a continuous and active Athenian historical narrative, the epitaphios not only engages with the traditional questions of active death and response to death, but also enables the collective history of the polis to function as a genre of praise.[34] This is a strategy unavailable to the lament, which

---

[32] Loraux 3-4, 16.

[33] Cf. ξυνεκφέρει δὲ ὁ βουλόμενος καὶ ἀστῶν καὶ ξένων Thuc. 2.34.4 and the same motif in the epigrams: [εἴτε ἀστό]ς τις ἀνὲρ εἴτε χσένος | ἄλοθεν ἐλθὸν : (CEG 13.1), ἀσστοῖς καὶ χσένοισι Φάνες φίλος (CEG 112.1); cf. Loraux 79-97.

[34] Various traditional themes of praise poetry persist, such as the possibility of audience φθόνος at excessive praise (2.35.2-3), the need for the listeners to be able to match the deeds praised (2.35.2), or the paralleling of the activities of laudator and laudandus, to be discussed in further detail below. Yet this praise of the dead is consistently superimposed upon that of the city, and the laments' and the archaic epigrams' traditional themes are fused with and even displaced by civic themes (Loraux 44-52). As civic praise for the dead,

marks death as the end of the deceased's activity, and to the grave epigram, whose static nature necessitates the mention of death and whose limited writing space and reading public dictates less reference to larger history. By contrast, history constitutes the majority of the epitaphios in that it forms the basis for situating the warriors' death within an Athenian chronology and for communicating to the listeners about the polis and its paradigms of behavior:

> ὧν ἐγὼ τὰ μὲν κατὰ πολέμους ἔργα... μακρηγορεῖν ἐν εἰδόσιν οὐ βουλόμενος ἐάσω. ἀπὸ δὲ οἵας τε ἐπιτηδεύσεως ἤλθομεν ἐπ' αὐτα καὶ μεθ' οἵας πολιτείας καὶ τρόπων ἐξ οἵων μεγάλα ἐγένετο, ταῦτα δηλώσας πρῶτον εἶμι ἐπὶ τὸν τῶνδε ἔπαινον, νομίζων ἐπί τε τῶι παρόντι οὐκ ἂν ἀπρεπῆ λεχθῆναι αὐτὰ καί τὸν πάντα ὅμιλον καὶ ἀστῶν καὶ ξένων ξύμφορον εἶναι ἐπακοῦσαι αὐτῶν (Thuc. 2.36.4).

Here, Thucydides' rendering of Pericles' funeral oration represents a simultaneous recognition and transformation of the epitaphios' traditional strategy of history as praise commemorating Athens' development.[35] The Thucydidean funeral oration of Pericles fully omits or merely alludes to various canonical episodes associated with Athenian history in other epitaphioi, such as autochthony (2.36.1), Athenian development of human culture, the conflict with the Amazons, or military and civic engagements for the unburied of the Seven or the Heraclidae, and the Persian Wars (2.36.2-4). In doing so, the funeral oration remains distinct from the other epitaphioi which are composed of specific recurring mythic and historical narratives and instead emphasizes a general movement of Athenian progress toward the present political and social moment.[36] The funeral oration nonetheless reproduces traditional structures by narrating the diachronic development of a collective Athenian lifestyle (ἐπιτηδεύσεις), political form (πολίτεια), and character (τρόποι) and by presenting the history of communal life as collective praise within which the accomplishment of the individual dead can be situated (Thuc. 2.36.4). As the civic ritual becomes the framework within which individuals or families express socially acceptable grief, the epitaphios comes to represent a civic subor-

---

the epitaphios assumes a collectivity that contrasts markedly with the traditional position of the individual praise poet with his laudandus. Here, the collectively chosen orator celebrates the group of deceased before a collective audience of citizens; accordingly, the epitaphios' format reinforces the impression of a secular and publicly accessible historiographic-praise genre, composed in prose with minimal references to the divine or to the poetic tradition (Loraux 53, 56).

[35] On this function of the epitaphios, see G. P. Landmann, 'Das Lob Athens in der Grabrede des Perikles (Thukydides II 34-41),' *Mus. Helv.* 31 (1974): 65-95.

[36] Landmann 76-78.

dination of private expression that allows for a collective history attaching political significance to the individual death.

The collective burial and the epitaphios result from the ongoing Athenian mistrust of private funerary activity and reflect a continuing pattern of civic control and replacement of familial activity.[37] As the epitaphios obscures the fact of death, the individuality of the dead warriors is subsumed by the memory of their paradigmatic behavior in service of the polis. This collective commemoration of the dead is paralleled by a collectivity in the performance of the funeral oration within Thucydides' narrative; the oration itself reinforces the communal activity with its predominance of the first person plural and collective singular nouns, and with its alignment between individual and collective interests that signals the unity of the democratic polis:

> καὶ ἐκεῖνοί τε ἄξιοι ἐπαίνου καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον οἱ πατέρες *ἡμῶν*. κτησάμενοι γὰρ πρὸς οἷς ἐδέξαντο ὅσην *ἔχομεν* ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἀπόνως ἡμῖν τοῖς νῦν προσκατέλιπον. τὰ δὲ πλείω αὐτῆς αὐτοὶ *ἡμεῖς* οἵδε οἱ νῦν ἔτι ὄντες μάλιστα ἐν τῆι καθεστηκυίαι ἡλικίαι *ἐπηυξήσαμεν* καὶ τὴν *πόλιν τοῖς πασι παρεσκευάσαμεν* καὶ ἐς πόλεμον καὶ ἐς εἰρήνην αὐταρκεστάτην (Thuc. 2.36.2-4)

This passage reveals the epitaphios' general avoidance of individuality, except in oppositions or pairs or in terms of the autarchy of Athens as a collective singular[38]; from here, the 'telescopic' structure of the funeral oration advances from the specific group of dead to the singular polis as a paradigm (Thuc. 2.37.1), as a competitor with Sparta (2.41.1), and finally as a geographically and chronologically omnipresent power (2.41.4, 43.3). This recurring contrast between the singular city and the groups of deceased, mourners, and citizens underlines both the uniqueness of the polis and the vital interrelationship between praise for the dead and praise for the city within the epitaphios.[39] Not only is the genre of the epitaphios particular to Athens, but its recurring thematization of the uniqueness of the city[40] appropriates the singularity of the dead as a collective civic 'character' that in turn highlights the singularity of the

---

[37] Loraux 23-5.

[38] Gaiser 31-3, Kakridis 61-2. See Kakridis 28 on the consistent pairing and opposition of single elements in the oration. Cf. J. S. Rusten, 'Two lives or three? Pericles on the Athenian character (Thuc. 2.40.2),' *CQ* 35 (1985): 14-19 on the epitaphios' goals of speaking of the ἐπιτήδευσις, πολίτεια, and τρόποι of Athenians (2.36.4), narrated in the first person φιλοκαλοῦμεν, φιλοσοφοῦμεν, χρώμεσθα (2.40.1), thus presenting various alternative lifestyles for the individual, but all within a group context.

[39] Loraux 2-3.

[40] On this theme, expressed by the use of μόνος (2.40.2, 40.5, 41.3), see Loraux 1.

polis.[41] Thus, the epitaphios can be identified as a genre of praise of the dead presented within a parainetic setting in the oration[42]; by shifting its focus from individual loss to the parallel activity of Athenian citizens and their polis, the epitaphios' historical narrative allows for the representation of the city as a paradigm.[43]

By displacing its memorialization fully onto the polis, the epitaphios represents history as a medium of praise, a function which is inaccessible to the individual lament for the momentary liminality of death ritual and which is only partially realized within the spatial limits of the epigram as the historical context of the individual life and as the praise of the social type the deceased embodies. In its agon with lament and epigram, the epitaphios explicitly attempts to override these temporal and spatial limits of the rival genres, which, as we have seen, both pre-exist and co-exist with it. While the epitaphios is limited to the situation of civic ritual, its functions echo and innovate upon that of the lament in its chronological mediation of death, by situating the warriors' death within the collective history of the polis; the past history of the polis leads to the immediate sacrifice of the citizen-soldiers, which is resolved by the parainetic conclusion directed toward the future behavior of the citizens in response. Yet this chronological structure is also superimposed upon an increasing universalization of the discussion which telescopes from individual Athenian generations to the chronological and geographical ubiquity of Athens' activity and thus obscures or at best incorporates individual losses within the narrative of the polis.

Like the archaic epigram, which reduces the Homeric concept of the warrior's lifelong attainment of κλέος to the moment of death, the funeral oration concentrates the commemoration of the fallen warrior on his momentary attainment of status through death (ἀγαθὸς γενόμενος, Thuc. 2.35.1).[44] The resulting reduction of the warrior's achievement to the

---

[41] See R. Koselleck, 'Kriegerdenkmale als Identitätsstiftungen der Überlebenden,' in O. Marquard and K. Stierle, eds., *Identität* (Munich, 1979): 255-276, especially 256-7 on the necessary identity between war dead and civic goals, communicated between the members of a state in order to create meaning for death.

[42] ἀνὴρ ἡιρημένος ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως... λέγει ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἔπαινον τὸν πρέποντα (2.34.6), καὶ ἐκεῖνοι [οἱ πρόγονοι, 36.1] τε ἄξιοι ἐπαίνου καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν (2.36.2); πρῶτον εἶμι καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν τῶνδε ἔπαινον (2.36.4). For the behavior of the dead used as a paradigm for the living, especially in their civic activity: 2.41.5, 42.1-2, 43.1-5; cf. Loraux 49.

[43] παράδειγμα δὲ μᾶλλον αὐτοὶ ὄντες (2.37.1), τῆς Ἑλλάδος παίδευσις (2.41.1); see Gaiser 21.

[44] Loraux 100-6, J. S. Rusten, 'Structure, style, and sense in interpreting Thucydides: the soldier's choice (Thuc. 2.42.4),' *HSCP* 90 (1986): 49-76, esp. 72-5.

instant of death reemphasizes its position as a singular incident within the long-term narrative of the polis, which supersedes the individual. Here, the typologizing of individuals performed by the archaic epigram becomes a mass typology of single citizens with their individual traits transformed at death into the paradigm of the singular Athenian character:

> καὶ γὰρ τοῖς τἆλλα χείροσι δίκαιον τὴν ἐς τοὺς πολέμους ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος ἀνδραγαθίαν προτίθεσθαι. ἀγαθῷ γὰρ κακὸν ἀφανίσαντες κοινῶς μᾶλλον ὠφέλησαν ἢ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἔβλαψαν (Thuc. 2.42.3).

The analogical life of the individual citizen and the polis are paralleled throughout, as for example in their mutual display of autarchy: πόλιν... αὐταρκεστάτην (Thuc. 2.36.3-4); τὸ σῶμα αὔταρκές (2.41.2). The epitaphios realigns the individual warriors' life span as part of the continuity of the polis by superimposing the praise of the individual warriors onto the history of the city. Each stage of the individual's life is paralleled and superseded by the analogical stages in the life of the city: birth / [autochthonous] origins, upbringing / eulogy, the accomplishments of the contemporary generation / the precedents set by ancestors.[45] The chronological character of the epitaphios is no longer marked by mediation of death's liminality and future reintegration as in a lament, but by the ongoing progress of generations within the unending life of the polis; the civic paradigm of the past is realized in the present and the present accomplishments of the warriors and the citizen audience provide a paradigm for the future.[46] The present becomes paradigmatic both in the warriors' instantaneous attainment of goodness through death and in the present historical moment in Athens' development, which are associated with each other by prompting the citizen action that ensures the continuity of the polis:

> κτησάμενοι γάρ πρὸς οἷς ἐδέξαντο ὅσην ἔχομεν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἀπόνως ἡμῖν τοῖς νῦν προσκατέλιπον. τὰ δὲ πλείω αὐτῆς αὐτοὶ ἡμεῖς οἵδε οἱ νῦν ἔτι ὄντες μάλιστα ἐν τῇ καθεστηκυίαι ἡλικίαι ἐπηυξήσαμεν καὶ τὴν πόλιν τοῖς πᾶσι παρεσκευάσαμεν καὶ ἐς πόλεμον καὶ ἐς εἰρήνην αὐταρκεστάτην (Thuc. 2.36.2-4).

In death, the agency of the individual choice for death is transferred to Athens as a historical agent through time and as a timeless paradigm that motivates citizen action within historical time (παράδειγμα δὲ μᾶλλον αὐτοὶ ὄντες Thuc. 2.37.1).[47] Through this recurring analogy between individual

---

[45] Loraux 104-6.
[46] Loraux 121-3.
[47] Loraux 133-4, 145.

and communal action, the epitaphios replaces the chronological rupture of death with a representation of death as a moment of agency which confirms the unity of the Athenian past, present, and future in the warriors' sacrifice, the polis' re-affirmation of civic values and reciprocity in the epitaphios, and the resulting continuity of citizen action.

The epitaphios also points to the spatial limitation of the gravesite as a commemorative medium; in the Thucydidean funeral oration, the inscribed gravesite remains subordinate to the actions of the dead, whose memory persists within a broader geography than that of the gravesite. While the inscribed stele merely signifies (σημαίνει 2.43.3) and therefore introduces possible communicative ambiguities, the epitaphios dislodges the memory of the dead from its place at the gravesite and expands it geographically to the areas of Athenian influence and beyond:

> μετὰ μεγάλων δὲ σημείων καὶ οὐ δή τοι ἀμάρτυρόν γε τὴν δύναμιν παρασχόμενοι τοῖς τε νῦν καὶ τοῖς ἔπειτα θαυμασαθησόμεθα, καὶ οὐδὲν προσδεόμενοι οὔτε Ὁμήρου ἐπαινέτου οὔτε ὅστις ἔπεσι μὲν τὸ αὐτίκα τέρψει, τῶν δ' ἔργων τὴν ὑπόνοιαν ἡ ἀλήθεια βλάψει, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν μὲν θάλασσαν καὶ γῆν ἐσβατὸν τῆι ἡμετέραι τόλμηι καταναγκάσαντες γενέσθαι, πανταχοῦ δὲ μνημεῖα κακῶν τε κἀγαθῶν αἴδια ξυνκατοικίσαντες (Thuc. 2.41.4).

> ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ἐπιφανῶν πᾶσα γῆ τάφος, καὶ οὐ στηλῶν μόνον ἐν τῆι οἰκείαι σημαίνει ἐπιγραφή, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῆι μὴ προσηκούσηι ἄγραφος μνήμη παρ' ἑκάστωι τῆς γνώμης μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ ἔργου ἐνδιαιτᾶται (Thuc. 2.43.3-4).

In this universal memorialization of the Athenian dead through their actions, the epitaphios interprets the progress of civic history and the citizens' contact with others as a generation of memory that persists among many different individuals and thus eludes written and visual representation: πανταχοῦ δὲ μνημεῖα...αἴδια (Thuc. 2.41.4), ἐν τῆι μὴ προσηκούσηι ἄγραφος μνήμη παρ' ἑκάστωι (2.43.3).[48] The actions of the Athenians and their deceased represent μνημεῖα...αἴδια which overwhelm and colonize the geography with which they come in contact (καταναγκάσαντες, ξυνκατοικίσαντες) (2.41.4). This imperialistic image identifies the extent of memory for the dead with the reach of Athenian power; while, much like the epigrams, the oration uses deictics referring to the present ceremony and the polis[49], it detaches its significance from the contexts of specific

---

[48] Cf. also Demosth. 60.13, Lysias 2.66, Plato *Menexenus* 235b and Gorgias 82B6: σέμνοι μὲν τοὺς θεοὺς... ὅσιοι δὲ πρὸς τοὺς τοκέας... δίκαιοι πρὸς τοὺς ἄστους... εὐσεβεῖς πρὸς τοὺς φίλους...

[49] e.g. ἐνθάδε (2.35.1), οἷα κα νῦν περὶ τὸν τάφον τόνδε δημοσίαι παρασκευασθέντα ὁρᾶτε (2.35.1); cf. ἐνθάδε (often with κεῖσθαι) in Lysias 2.1, 20, 54, 60, 75, 76, Plato *Menexenus* 242d, e, 243c, 246a.

individuals, geography, and time to associate itself with the polis' history and its territorial expansion of power. Where private funerary genres function to isolate the deceased in time and space through treatment of the ritual passage of the dead or through the isolation of the gravesite, the civic funeral oration locates the deceased's memory within the city, which extends temporally and spatially through the continuation of Athenian history and the martial successes of passing generations.

4.3 *The Epitaphios as an Oral Genre*

This temporal and spatial extension of memory is linked with the oral performance of the epitaphios; the moment of the oration becomes a transition from the historic past of the polis over the crisis of death to the generation of continued political activity. The position of the epitaphios as an oral genre within a ritually and socially bounded situation is clear from the prologue and the epilogue of Pericles' funeral oration. While the prologue treats the performance expectations of the audience (2.35), the epilogue employs a traditional dismissal of the mourners for further private lament, at which point the city's promise of education for the surviving orphans signals the resumption of life in the polis (2.46-7).[50] Though written within the context of the Thucydidean history[51], the funeral oration, like other epitaphioi, asserts the primacy of its own oral performance through its presentation of orality as the central characteristic and guarantor of the Athenian democracy. As a spoken genre, the epitaphios parallels the function of the polis as a political institution, which similarly attempts to link λόγος and ἔργον through oral exchange as an impetus to action. The oral nature of the epitaphios in performance is highlighted

---

[50] Gaiser 26-7, Loraux 78, 225.

[51] The fact that Pericles' funeral oration represents a oral performance embedded within the frame narrative of a written history accounts for various aspects in this funeral oration that acknowledge the importance of writing and written sources for Thucydides' own history, such as the use of δηλοῦν to describe the activities of the orator and the historian as well as the funeral oration's exclusion of mythical topoi of Athenian prehistory. According to Edmunds 831-852, the importance of the Thucydidean history as a written text lies in its position as a book intended for a small audience of readers rather than for performance or reading aloud, an aspect expressed in the author's polemics against the logographers. The author's authority is based on his presence as the composer of the written text in the past and as the commentator in the history in each reading of the written text in the present; writing represents a solution to the problems of oral narrative in that it preserves access to truth by preventing textual distortion by popularization or for gratification in performance.

throughout, both in terms of the speaker's delivery of the oration and of the listeners' role: οὐκ ἂν ἀπρεπῆ λεχθῆναι αὐτὰ καὶ τὸν πάντα ὅμιλον καὶ ἀστῶν καὶ ξένων εἶναι ἐπακοῦσαι αὐτῶν (Thuc. 2.36.4). The other epitaphioi also highlight the nature of the epitaphios as an oral performance *per se* and as a historical narrative that draws on oral tradition for its accounts of autochthony, the conflict with the Amazons, and various other legendary episodes.[52]

With its λόγος-ἔργον opposition in treating the soldiers' death[53], the funeral oration both promotes its own authority as an oral performance and perpetuates the traditional λόγος-ἔργον opposition of epitaphioi and of the Thucydidean history in general. In the funeral oration, the initial rhetorical questions of the compatibility of λόγος and ἔργον are resolved by the function of the epitaphios as ἔργον and by the polis, which unifies thought and actuality in political life.[54] When the epitaphios revises the verbal act of the speech as an ἔργον, the civic gravesite no longer figures as the resting place of the body, but as the location where the reputation and praise of the dead are left behind and continually regenerated, an activity which consists in speech:

> κοινῆι γὰρ τὰ σώματα διδόντες ἰδίαι τὸν ἀγήρων ἔπαινον ἐλάμβανον καὶ τὸν τάφον ἐπισημότατον, οὐκ ἐν ᾧ κεῖνται μᾶλλον, ἀλλ' ἐν ᾧ ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν παρὰ τῷ ἐντυχόντι αἰεὶ καὶ λόγου καί ἔργου καιρῶι αἰείμνηστος καταλείπεται. (Thuc. 2.43.2)

---

[52] e.g. ἀκούειν (Demosth. 60.29), λέγεσθαι (Demosth. 60.30), ὁμολογεῖσθαι (Demosth. 60.4), παραλαμβάνειν (Demosth. 60.28), the interpretation of the actions of the dead and their survivors in light of the proverb τὸ μηδὲν ἄγαν λεγόμενον (*Menexenus* 247e-248c); cf. also Plato *Menexenus* 234c ff., which suggests orations based on a tradition of set formulae: ἐκ πολλοῦ χρόνου λόγους παρασκευομένων.

[53] Adam Parry, 'Thucydides' Use of Abstract Language,' *Language as Action*, *Yale French Studies* 45 (1970): 11-15, 19-20. Parry describes the λόγος-ἔργον antithesis as a 'social abstraction,' i.e. a motif with reference to human reality, in which outside actuality (ἔργον) confronts the individual, who may attempt to impose a λόγος upon it, such as history or the epitaphios. See also Adam Parry, *Logos and ergon in Thucydides* (NY, 1981) 159-175 on this antithesis in the epitaphios. J. Ober ('Thucydides' Criticism of Democratic Knowledge,' in R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell, eds., *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1993): 92-8) argues that various oppositions within the speech, including the λόγος-ἔργον opposition, remain unresolved throughout the speech and thus reveal ambiguities about the truth of the funeral oration. As I attempt to show here, these oppositions are indeed outlined throughout the speech, perhaps even echoing the juxtapositions of opposites typical in other speech about the dead; yet they are finally resolved through the institution of the epitaphios, whose conclusion marks the transition from private mourning to continued civic activity, in which speech as well as action play a central role.

[54] Parry *Logos* 160-7; ἀπὸ δὲ οἵας τε ἐπιτηδεύσεως (2.36.4), πιστεύοντες οὐ ταῖς παρασκευαῖς τὸ πλέον καὶ ἀπάταις ἢ τῶι... ἐς τὰ ἔργα εὐψύχωι (2.39.1). οὐκ ἂν πολλοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἰσόρροπος ὥσπερ τῶνδε ὁ λόγος τῶν ἔργων φανείη (2.42.2).

Here, the reciprocity between living and dead consists of an alternation of interrelated verbal and material communication, beginning with the warriors' sacrifice of their bodies (διδόντες), rewarded by praise and the civic gravesite: τὸν ἀγήρων ἔπαινον ἐλάμβανον καὶ τὸν τάφον ἐπισημότατον. The burial represents not the end of the warriors' individual activity (οὐκ... κεῖνται[55]) but the persistence of their memory through the continued speech and action within the polis, originating with the epitaphios at the gravesite.

The Thucydidean funeral oration in particular separates itself from prior speakers by associating them with speech *per se*, while by contrast, Pericles attempts to reify the ἔργα of the dead in a speech that is itself an ἔργον with substance analogical to a material memorial:

> οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ τῶν ἐνθάδε ἤδη *εἰρηκότων* ἐπαινοῦσι τὸν προσθέντα τῶι νόμωι τὸν λόγον τόνδε, ὡς καλὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐκ τῶν πολέμων θαπτομένοις *ἀγορεύεσθαι* αὐτόν. ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρκοῦν ἂν ἐδόκει εἶναι ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν *ἔργωι* γενομένων *ἔργωι* καὶ *δηλοῦσθαι* τὰς τίμας, οἷα κα νῦν περὶ τὸν τάφον τόνδε δημοσίαι παρασκευασθέντα ὁρᾶτε ... (Thuc. 2.35.1)

As the performance of the funeral oration aspires to parallel the action of the warriors, both the individual speaker and the warriors are shown to run risks in the interest of the polis through their analogical speech and civic activity:

> καὶ μὴ ἐν ἑνὶ ἀνδρὶ πολλῶν ἀρετὰς *κινδυνεύεσθαι* εὖ τε καὶ χεῖρον εἰπόντι πιστευθῆναι (Thuc. 2.35.2)
> καὶ μὴ μετὰ νόμων τὸ πλέον ἢ τρόπων ἀνδρείας ἐθέλομεν *κινδυνεύειν*... (2.39.4)
> *κινδύνων* ἅμα τόνδε κάλλιστον νομίσαντες (2.42.4)[56]

Accordingly, the criteria for the evaluation of the speech rest upon the listeners' ability to reconcile the speaker's account of the dead with their personal knowledge of the deceased and with their estimation of their ability to translate the narrated deeds of the epitaphios into their own actions (Thuc. 2.35.2). The effectiveness of the epitaphios as λόγος is based not only on its successful appropriation of the attributes of the material monument as ἔργον, but also depends on its alignment of the paradigmatic activities of the warriors and the speaker, which can be

---

[55] Cf. κεῖσθαι on the inscriptions of grave monuments, e.g. X ἐνθάδε...κεῖται and its variants (CEG 76, 80i, 85, 91, 95, 102, 105, 108, 126, 170, 175ii).

[56] Thuc. 2.39.1, 40.3; cf. Demosthenes 60 and Hyperides 6 passim for κίνδυνος as martial risk, and Lysias 2 passim for κίνδυνος as both martial (2.3, 5, 9, etc.) and verbal (2.54) risk.

translated into the ἔργα of its hearers. Thus, the death of the warriors becomes an impetus to renewed action in the polis, extending from individual engagement of the speaker, listener, or warrior to the domestic and foreign activities of the Athenians as a whole.

The conclusion of the funeral oration confirms the parallel activities of the speech, the burial of the dead, and the civic engagement for the survivors as the fulfillment of ritual duty:

> εἴρηται καὶ ἐμοὶ λόγῳ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὅσα εἶχον πρόσφορα, καὶ ἔργῳ οἱ θαπτόμενοι τὰ μὲν ἤδη κεκόσμηνται, τὰ δὲ αὐτῶν τοὺς παῖδας τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦδε δημοσίαι ἡ πόλις μέχρι ἥβης θρέψει (Thuc. 2.46).

Here, the appropriate expression of the speaker (πρόσφορα) is paralleled with the civic construction of the tomb, which occurs together with the speech as part of funerary ritual, and with the state's rearing of the warriors' orphaned children, beginning at the conclusion of the speech (ἀπὸ τοῦδε); the funeral oration thus stands as an ἔργον matching the activities of both the polis and its warriors[57] as well as marking the midpoint of the interchange between the warriors' death and the polis' response. Other epitaphioi likewise understand the epitaphios as marking both the midpoint of reciprocity between the city and its dead and the transition from the liminal moment of death and death ritual to the onset of the city's care for the deceased and his survivors.[58] The polis' reciprocity with the warriors is understood as extending from the point of the delivery of the epitaphios onward:

> Ὡς μὲν οὖν ἡ πόλις σπουδάζει περὶ τοὺς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τελευτῶντας ἔκ τε τῶν ἄλλων ἔστιν ἰδεῖν καὶ μάλιστ' ἐκ τοῦδε τοῦ νόμου καθ' ὃν αἱρεῖται τὸν ἐροῦντ' ἐπὶ ταῖς δημοσίαις τάφαις (Demosth. 60.1-2).

Through this reciprocity, the polis perpetuates the ideals presented in the epitaphios' history of the relationship of citizens and polis; the delivery of the epitaphios represents the point at which public and private, λόγος and ἔργον meet in the commemoration of the dead (Plato *Men.* 236d-e). Much as in the archaic epigrams, where the monument embodies the reciprocity between the deceased and the survivors (CEG 42, 57, 58, 165, 169), the final parainetic section of the epitaphios outlines and re-affirms the

---

[57] See Loraux 240 on the typical reconciliation of λόγος and ἔργον after the epitaphios' praise of the city.

[58] Demosth. 60.33, 36-7; Hyperides 6.42-3; Lysias 2.66, 79-80, Plato *Men.* 240e-241a, 248e-249c.

mutual obligations of the citizens and their polis and so marks a transformative moment in which death is re-configured as a moment of reciprocity between the dead and the polis. The epitaphios also marks the moment where various individual human weaknesses are transformed into positive attributes within the shared civic history: death becomes a confirmation of ἀρετή, the ephemeral nature of the body is opposed to the lasting glory of the dead, and the loss of a child becomes an impetus for new births.[59] The epitaphios mediates between the deceased and the orphaned generations, between the historical generations and the audience, and between human limitations and their transformation; it resolves the crisis of death by linking generations within the polis through active reciprocity over the boundary of the death ritual.

The correspondence between λόγος and ἔργον in the epitaphios is based on the central role of speech in the state, where deliberation serves to inform and inspire the citizen to action and reciprocity (Thuc. 2.40.2-3); although it forms a central part of the civic death ritual, the epitaphios detaches itself from death by associating itself with the continual action of the Athenian citizens and by assimilating itself to the political discourse which is so vital to the Athenian self-definition. In the Athenian state, λόγος and ἔργον are connected in the name δημοκρατία:

> καὶ ὄνομα μὲν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐς ὀλίγους ἀλλ' ἐς πλείονας οἰκεῖν δημοκρατία κέκληται. μέτεστι δὲ κατὰ μὲν τοὺς νόμους πρὸς τὰ ἴδια διάφορα πᾶσι τὸ ἴσον, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀξίωσιν, ὡς ἕκαστος ἐν τῳ εὐδοκιμεῖ, οὐκ ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ πλέον ἐς τὰ κοινὰ ἢ ἀπ' ἀρετῆς προτιμᾶται, οὐδ' αὖ κατὰ πενίαν, ἔχων γέ τι ἀγαθὸν δρᾶσαι τὴν πόλιν, ἀξιώματος ἀφανείαι κεκώλυται (Thuc. 2.37.1).[60]

As in various traditional usages (e.g. κόρε κεκλέσομαι αἰεί CEG 24), the appearance of καλεῖσθαι for the democracy alludes to a new collective κλέος attached to the name δημοκρατία; similarly, the emphasis on the

[59] Gaiser 34-42.

[60] Cf. Demosth. 60.26, Lysias 2.18, and Plato *Men.* 238c-d, where the oration's history similiarly thematizes the unique institution of δημοκρατία in Athens. Raphael Sealey ('The Origins of *Demokratia*,' *ClasAnt* 6 (1973): 280-3) argues that the use of δημοκρατία as in Thucydides is in general rarely used by advocates of democracy, and here represents an apologetic usage; Ober ('Thucydides' Criticism' 94-5) similarly notes the contrast between the name δημοκρατία and the reality of Athenian meritocracy. Yet, when considered in parallel with other epitaphioi, this passage reveals a suggestive association of δημοκρατία with κλέος in καλεῖσθαι and a topos of δημοκρατία common to the funeral oration and other epitaphioi. Despite variations in the treatment of the Athenian system, each epitaphios praises the Athenian polis under a specific name, which displaces the name of the individual deceased.

name of the Athenian political system in the absence of named dead and a named orator displaces the traditional citation of the deceased's name in lament and epigram onto the explicit naming of the polis. The μέν-δέ contrast of this passage juxtaposes this verbal κλέος of Athenian democracy (ὄνομα μέν...δημοκρατία κέκληται) with the real implementation of δημοκρατία in the polis based on equality of all citizens balanced with consideration of the ἀρετή of the individual (μέτεστι δέ...). Beyond the immediately transparent significance of the name δημοκρατία, the implementation of democracy relies on oral means of governing the polis – the citizens' obedience to the spoken commands of those in power and to the unwritten laws based on oral consensus:

> τῶν τε αἰεὶ ἐν ἀρχῆι ὄντων *ἀκροάσει* καὶ τῶν νόμων, καὶ μάλιστα αὐτῶν ὅσοι τε ἐπ' ὠφελίαι τῶν ἀδικουμένων κεῖνται καὶ ὅσοι *ἄγραφοι* ὄντες *ὁμολογουμένην* φέρουσιν (Thuc. 2.37.3).

Both the Periclean funeral oration and the other epitaphioi concentrate on collective names for the Athenians and their political system and so displace the individual name from its prominent position in lament and epigram; instead, the epitaphioi emphasize the polis' unification of λόγος and ἔργον and reinforce their own generic authority by highlighting the central position of verbal exchange within the polis and their own analogically significant speech.

There are various parallels to the Thucydidean funeral oration in the other epitaphioi, each of which emphasize the name of the Athenian political system and its unity with the actuality of Athenian life:

> καλεῖ δὲ ὁ μὲν αὐτὴν δημοκρατίαν, ὁ δὲ ἄλλο, ᾧ ἂν χαίρῃ. ἔστι δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μετ' εὐδοξίας πλήθους ἀριστοκρατία (Plato *Men.* 238c-d).[61]

In Demosthenes (60.27-31), the orator outlines the oral traditions of the figures who lend their names to the Athenian tribes and their significance for the activity of each tribe in the present day: ᾔδεσαν πάντες Ἐρεχθεῖδαι τὸν ἐπώνυμον αὐτῶν Ἐρεχθέα, εἵνεκα τοῦ σῶσαι τὴν χώραν... (60.27). The propagation of the Athenian name is connected with the polis' martial successes, which both generate memory and perpetuate the persistence of names; in Lysias' epitaphios, the defeat of the Amazons illustrates the contrast between the ongoing memory of Athenian accomplishment and the anonymity of the Amazons:

[61] Cf. σωτῆρες ὠνομάσθησαν (Demosth. 60.8), παῖδες οἱ τούτων ὀνομαστοὶ τραφήσονται (Demosth. 60.32).

> τῆσδε μὲν τῆς πόλεως διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν *ἀθάνατον τὴν μνήμην* ἐποίησαν [i.e. the Amazons], τὴν δὲ ἑαυτῶν πατρίδα διὰ τὴν ἐνθάδε συμφορὰν *ἀνώνυμον* κατέστησαν (Lysias 2.6).

Though he highlights the prominent role of the general Leosthenes as representative of the general accomplishments of the dead (6.15), Hyperides likewise picks up on the theme of collective names by denying and thus transforming the very name of death:

> οὐ γὰρ θεμιτὸν το του τοῦ ὀνόματος [i.e. ἀπολωλότων] τυχεῖν τοὺς οὕτως ὑπὲρ καλῶν τὸ⟨ν⟩ βίον ἐκλιπόντας... πῶς [τούτους] ἐκλελοιπέναι τὸν βίον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεγονέναι καλλίω γένεσιν τῆς πρώτης ὑπαρξάσης; τότε μὲν γὰρ παῖδες ὄντες ἄφρονες ἦσαν, νῦν δ' ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ γεγόνασιν (6.27-8).

By contrast to the traditional presence of the deceased's name as an invocation in the lament and as the core information in the inscribed grave epigram, the epitaphios thus suppresses the facts of death and individual loss by foregrounding the name of the polis or the collective names for the Athenians in its own narrative.

These names take on added significance in that they reflect Athenian communal activity as dependent on speech; by foregrounding the unity of λόγος and ἔργον in the polis, the epitaphios legitimizes its own function as civic speech:

> ἀνθρώποις δὲ προσήκειν νόμῳ μὲν ὁρίσαι τὸ δίκαιον, λόγῳ δὲ πεῖσαι, ἔργῳ δὲ τούτοις ὑπηρετεῖν, ὑπὸ νόμου μὲν βασιλευομένους, ὑπὸ λόγου δὲ διδασκομένους (Lysias 2.19, cf. 46).

The epitaphios' project of legitimizing its own speech is buttressed by its portrayals of speech as central to the Athenian identity. Citizen action in the Athenian polis is motivated by fear of verbal reproach and its democracy is characterized by free speech:

> αἱ δὲ δημοκρατίαι πολλά τ' ἄλλα καὶ καλὰ καὶ δίκαι' ἔχουσιν ὧν τὸν εὖ φρονοῦντ' ἀντέχεσθαι δεῖ, καὶ τὴν παρρησίαν τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἠρτημένην οὐκ ἔστι τἀληθὲς δηλοῦν ἀποτρέψαι (Demosthenes 60.26[62]).

For the epitaphios, the fusion of λόγος and ἔργον is realized through the polis and its characteristic verbal communication; this civic unity of speech and action parallels the aspirations of the epitaphios to match the concrete ἔργα of the funeral monument and the death of the warriors through an oral medium.

[62] Cf. 28 and Gorgias DK 82B6.16ff.

As a singular oral performance, each epitaphios represents a generic tradition of topoi that are varied according to individual orators and occasions while each reflects the importance of verbal interchange within the polis and marks the beginning of the reciprocity between the polis and its dead and surviving citizens. While focused on this singular moment of performance in the civic setting[63], the epitaphios overcomes the liminal moment of death by contextualizing the individual death within the diachronic, ubiquitous, and collective narrative of the polis and by innovating upon and perpetuating the conventions of the epitaphios that serve as the traditional basis for civic speech. By both acknowledging the necessity of ritual lament and defining itself as the civic completion of private mourning, the epitaphios reflects a general trend shown in the Pindaric threnoi with their assertions of generic authority for lament and Sophocles' *Antigone*, with its simultaneous acknowledgement and subordination of mourning within the polis. The epitaphios recognizes and attempts to resolve the temporal and spatial limitations of its rival genres of lament and epigram by associating its praise of the dead with the history and geographic expansion of Athenian power. While engaging in a definitive agon with lament and epigram as pre-existing and necessarily co-existing genres of mourning, the epitaphios adopts oral and material strategies from each genre to legitimate its own authority; in its oral history, the epitaphios consequently defines itself in analogy to the polis in its fusion of λόγος and ἔργον. In doing so, the epitaphios re-affirms the typical modes of speech and action that characterize the polis: freedom of verbal expression and speech as an impetus for action; the care for the parents, widows, and orphans of the dead; and the celebration of the dead through informal communication and the epitaphios itself. Each new performance and innovation on the traditional epitaphioi acknowledges and subordinates private mourning within its own re-creation and unification of those modes of speech and action that are typical for the living polis.

CHAPTER FIVE

SOME CONCLUSIONS

The study of mourning genres from orality to the archaic and classical cultures of oralcy yields some larger conclusions about the progress of literacy in Athens and about the nature of death ritual. As a common human experience, death and death ritual provide insight into oral, literate, and other genres of expression at the intersection between private and public and between individual and communal spheres. It has been the project of this study to examine how oral, written, and material genres differently represent death and mourning by availing themselves of oral, literate, and other referential strategies of expression, and what the ensuing development of genres and their interrelationship reveal about ancient attitudes toward death, mourning, and the effects of increasing literacy.

The progress of literacy is not a binary opposition between oral and written, as seen in the recurring privilege accorded to the material and active response to death; gesture, ritual activity, iconographic representations, and material monuments or artifacts add different levels of meaning to the exchange between the mourners and the dead and among the community of survivors. Further, the transition from orality to literacy does not develop in a linear manner with the introduction of writing. Written texts appropriate oral rhetoric acceptable within their new contexts, as in the first-person epigrams. Diverse oral and written genres also continue to evolve on the basis of a simultaneous appropriation of and polemic against pre-existing written and material genres, as in the case of the Athenian epitaphios. While engaging with the temporal and spatial limits of lament and epigram, the Athenian epitaphios depends on the presence of lament as individual expression allowing for the narration of collective history and on the inscribed gravesite as a record for its collective civic history and as the definitive location for its own performance at the gravesite (ἐπιτάφιος). Down to the classical period, orality constitutes a central part of political exchange, with which oral mourning genres such as the lament and the epitaphios align themselves in Athens despite the presence and increasing proliferation of written texts. By engaging in a simultaneous agon with lament and epigram, Thucydides' funeral oration of Pericles acknowledges the necessary pre-existence and the singular validity of both oral and written genres. While the *Antigone* demonstrates

the necessity of the lament as private ritual expression, it also associates lament with the unhindered oral communication typical of the polis; similarly, the Thucydidean funeral oration assimilates its own speech to the definitive verbal exchanges within Athens. For those contemporaries contemplating the meaning of oral, material, and written artifacts of death ritual, such as Herodotus, each medium is considered in parallel with the others, yet has inherent ambiguities in its polysemy. Ultimately, the oral lament can be associated with characteristically Greek oral discourse as well as with private expression that tends toward political subversiveness, while writing possesses simultaneously foreign, deceptive, and permanent attributes.

Various ongoing debates about the function of death ritual have much to gain by considering the development of mourning in light of the arrival of literacy.[1] Death ritual functions both as communication with the dead person and as a dialogue among the living. Concepts such as the γέρας θανόντων in Homer and the reciprocity between living and dead in the epigrams and the Pindaric threnoi indicate the function of ritual for the deceased, while Homeric κλέος through epic and diachronic communication about the gravesite, the function of the epigram as an historical record, and the epitaphios as civic history suggest the role of death ritual as communication among the survivors. When considering the various

---

[1] See especially the ongoing dialogue between Morris ('Attitudes Toward Death in Archaic Greece,' *ClasAnt* 8.2 (1989): 296-320) and Sourvinou-Inwood ('To Die and Enter the House of Hades: Homer, Before and After,' in J. Whaley, ed., *Mirrors of Mortality* (London, 1981); 'A Trauma in Flux: Death in the 8th Century and After,' in R. Hägg, ed., *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B. C.: Tradition and Innovation* (Stockholm, 1983) 33-49; *'Reading' Greek Death: To the End of the Classical Period* (Oxford, 1995) 413-441) on the questions concerning the function of death ritual in Greece and the possible changes in attitudes toward death diachronically. Sourvinou-Inwood argues for shifts in attitudes toward death down to the classical period due to the evolution of different views of death in aristocratic-intellectual circles, the concurrent rise of individualism, and political changes such as colonization, the rise of the polis, and the increased rapidity of communications; these shifts result in an increasing anxiety about death that necessitates more distinct barriers between the living and the dead ((1995) 415ff.). Morris argues for a continuity in values from Homeric to classical sources, varying according to the context within which death or mourning ideology is employed, but consistently drawing on past models. Both scholars agree that the use of certain referential motifs, like the beautiful death of the warrior, remain constant but adopt new significance in the different Homeric or archaic contexts (Morris passim, Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 428). In considering the evidence for the changes brought about by writing, it seems simplistic to argue that any absolute changes occur. Instead, as both scholars admit to some extent, the social context of each text or performance determines both its singular perspective on death and its function as a genre of memory; as part of the durable referential system of the culture, various motifs persist in each genre and adopt new meanings appropriate in their different physical and temporal contexts (i.e. homeostasis).

media of death over time, the development of interdependent yet mutually exclusive genres such as lament, grave epigram, and epitaphios suggests that different genres lend themselves inherently more to one or the other function; the distance of the genre from the temporal and spatial location of death or death ritual determines its tendency toward historicity, attention to multiple audiences, and its singular interpretation of the significance of death. At the moment of death or within the context of death ritual, the lament's position as the verbal marker of the social transitions of the dead and the mourners determines its function as directed both toward the dead and toward the survivors. Various aspects of lament testify to the intimate connection between lament and the mourner's communication with the dead: the second person address to the deceased, the lament as part of the Homeric γέρας θανόντων, the connection between ἄχος and immediate revenge for the dead, and the Pindaric portrayal of the threnos as part of a reciprocity of song between living and dead communities. Conversely, other recurring motifs in lament seem to indicate that it serves as a type of communication among the living: the lament's imagination of the mourner's future social role, its attention to potential social tensions at fault in the death, and the analogy between various rites of passage (birth, marriage) that unite the deceased and the mourner.

The inscribed epigram exists as a durable verbal and material memorial following and marking the completion of death ritual. The epigram's function as such marks it as a final communication between the living and the dead, where the dedication of the epigram embodies χάρις (CEG 42i.2), γέρας θανόντο[ς] (CEG 40.2), or an object of exchange for the deceased's goodness in life (CEG 41i.2). Yet the epigram's connection of the deceased's stable identity with the gravesite, its retrospective documentation of completed death ritual, and its geographical and historical specificity also indicate its increasing role as communication among the living. This shift in focus is determined to a great extent by the epigram's diachronic durability, its construction following death ritual, and its resulting consciousness of the need to address multiple public audiences at the gravesite over time.

Finally, the epitaphios makes practically no concession to communication with the dead in the collective context; as a genre that both depends upon and subordinates the functions of lament and epigram as ritual passage and individual record, it can emphasize the ongoing life of the polis rather than individual death within its historical narrative. Thus, the temporal and spatial distance of each medium from the immediacy of death determines its varying function as communication with the dead or as dia-

logue among the living. This distance from the immediate situation of death and death ritual results in the increasingly public relevance of those genres that are generated or persist long after communicative memory, such as the epigram and the epitaphios' recurring topoi of Athenian history.

The evidence in the various genres I have studied above reveals perspectives on the significance of death and mourning that remain relatively consistent over time. Where emphases change, apparent shifts in attitude can often be associated with adaptations of referential tradition in the new performance or social contexts of different media. One example of such a development would be the persistent motif of the active death and active mourning. In epic, the grieving comrade's ritual action and revenge for the dead hero is privileged as the material of further epic κλέος. Similarly, the inscribed epigram designates the construction and inscription of its own medium (the monument) as an active response to death; solely the verbal and material demarcation of the warrior's gravesites draws attention away from the specific activities surrounding the burial to highlight the collective value of martial activity in the publicly accessible cemetery. Finally, in the orally performed epitaphios, the historical narrative of Athens parallels the death of the warrior, the oratorical risk of the speaker, and the engagement of the polis through its citizens in an analogy that confirms the simultaneous unity of speech and actuality in the epitaphios and in the city.

With the increasing relevance and permanence of the written memorial within the public domain, death adopts an additional significance as a civic act and as a collectively accessible historical fact; accordingly, mourning becomes associated with active reciprocity as well as the artistic and ritual activities of establishing a memorial. In the case of the epitaphios, the later oral performance genre in its public context attempts to bridge orality and literacy by drawing an analogy between the speech's reification of the warriors' death within polis history and the polis' realization of the unity of λόγος and ἔργον. This alignment between the functions of the epitaphios and the polis in uniting speech and actuality allows for the understanding of the public funeral oration as a concrete civic act in response to death.

Beyond the differences in context of each genre and the resulting shifts in emphasis on ritual, historical, or civic issues, there appears to be no radical change in understanding about the nature of death in our sources for ancient mourning. Rather, the meanings of death and mourning adapt as they are put to use by mourners in different social contexts and in various communicative media. Various motifs persist in multiple media

despite changes in oral or literate, private or civic emphases: priority given to the active death and active methods of death ritual, interest in chronological cycles or continuity, emphasis on the preservation of the name of the deceased, and attention to the extraordinary death. Death is consistently viewed as a chronological rupture and as a departure, while mourning is the transitional process in which this chronological rupture or absence is mediated by ritual or by changes in social structure, which are ideally expressed in active and material means; down to the classical period, both death and mourning are accepted as an inevitable aspect of human existence. From the Homeric lament to epigram, elegy, and the epitaphios, each genre places value on the preservation of a name that lends death significance, from the memory of Achilles' name following his funeral[2] and the epigram's core function of linking the deceased's name with the gravesite to the epitaphios' emphasis on the names associated with the Athenians – δημοκρατία, the alignment between tribal and heroic names, and the denial of the name of death.

Each genre also focuses its particular interest on the death of the warrior as an extraordinary and collectively relevant event meriting particular attention. The predominance of epigrams marking the extraordinary deaths of warriors and others dying untimely deaths in the earliest archaic funerary inscriptions suggests that we should understand writing as a marker and mediator of extremes. As a diachronic record, writing allows not only for the preservation of the extreme circumstances of death, but also for the assignment of permanent meaning to the death that is both a social typologization and a mediation of the potential liminality and ambiguity of an extraordinary death. From oral lament and epitaphios to the inscribed monument, the agglomeration of multiple media treating the extraordinary death suggests the non-linear progress of literacy as well as the redundancy typical of oral culture and a possible perception of the inability of individual genres to mediate the extraordinary death, which remains so prominent in our surviving texts. Further research into the connection between writing and the extraordinary individual – the extraordinary dead, the tyrant, the athletic victor – could yield more information about possibly analogical mechanisms of early written texts as markers and mediators of the outstanding individual within the community.

The nature of death ritual as a variously individuated and communal activity that can adopt private or public stances ultimately leads to the pro-

[2] *Od.* 24.93-4: ὡς σὺ μὲν οὐδὲ θανὼν ὄνομ' ὤλεσας, ἀλλά τοι αἰεὶ πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους κλέος ἔσσεται ἐσθλόν, Ἀχιλλεῦ.

liferation of several mutually exclusive levels of communication around the gravesite; this complex of different media shapes the strategies of each individual genre. Lament and mourning occupy a central position in the Homeric epics, elegy, and tragedy as a foil for the activities and memory of the living, as a competing genre of memory, or as an integral part of the protagonists' situation. The recurring agon with lament and the appropriation of its motifs in various other genres suggests its complex character as a necessary yet ambiguous genre through its associations with death ritual. Though our evidence only allows speculation, the Homeric epic itself seems to carry on an agon with lament as a competing oral genre of memory, perhaps because of both genres' similar functions of evaluating heroic life and events; conversely, the surviving threnoi suggest that one of the definitive aspects of lament may be self-legitimation through agon with competing genres of memory, as in Pindar fr. 128c, where various types of lament are set in opposition to the dithyramb and the paian. While lament serves as a foil for the performative τέρψις of sympotic poetry, the Pindaric threnoi answer with the τέρψις of the afterlife and the Thucydidean epitaphios with the τέρψις provided by civic activities.

Lament or mourning represents a central aspect of the protagonists of Homeric epic and Attic tragedy, such as Achilles, Odysseus, and Antigone. In each case, narrative closure is achieved through the protagonist's agency to end mourning, or to acknowledge and thus moderate mourning in familial or civic environments. Though epigram differs from lament in its function as a record of the stable identity of the dead, it also both appropriates aspects of lament by standing in as an emblem of mourning at the gravesite (CEG 14, 43.5, 139.2), while also serving as a supplementary genre that looks back at the ephemeral lament.[3] Epitaphios likewise depends on the pre-existence of lament as private ritual expression and of grave epigram as a record of completed ritual, while it critiques and attempts to surpass the temporal and spatial limits of these media in an ongoing narration of collective history. Within the different media of mourning and representations of mourning in the polis, lament and death ritual come to be acknowledged, yet also appropriated and subordinated to an increasingly historical and collective memory; the engagement of these various genres with the lament as the primary genre connected with the moment of death and death ritual embodies the simultaneous necessity and liminality of the genre in communal life.

---

[3] [ὅ]στις μὴ παρ[ε | τ]ύνχαν' ὅτ' ἐ[χσ] | έφερόν με θαν | όντα,
νῦν μ' ὀ[λο] | φυράσθω. μν[ῆμ] | α δὲ Τηλεφ[άνε] | ος. (CEG 159 [Thasos, ca. 500?])

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adkins, A. W. H., 'Callinus 1 and Tyrtaeus 10 as Poetry,' *HSCP* 81 (1977): 59-97.

—, 'Values, Goals, and Emotions in the *Iliad*,' *CP* 77 (1982): 292-326.

Alexiou, Margaret, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge, MA, 1974).

Amandry, P., 'Sur les "Epigrammes de Marathon",' *Theoria: Festschrift W.-H. Schuchhardt* (1960): 1-8.

Anastassiou, I., *Zum Wortfeld 'Trauer' in der Sprache Homers* (Hamburg, 1971).

van Andel, T. H., and C. Runnels, *Beyond the Acropolis: A Rural Greek Past* (New York, 1987).

Antonaccio, Carla, 'Contesting the Past: hero cult, tomb cult and epic in early Greece,' *AJA* 98.3 (1987): 389-411.

Arnould, Dominique, *Le rire et les larmes dans la littérature grecque d'Homère à Platon* (Paris, 1990).

Assmann, Jan, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich, 1992).

Averill, James R., 'Grief: its nature and significance,' *Psychological Bulletin* 70 (1968): 721-748.

Barron, John, 'All for Salamis,' in "*Owls to Athens*": *Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* ed. E. M. Craik (Oxford, 1990): 133-141.

Bassett, S. E., 'Achilles's Treatment of Hektor's Body,' *TAPA* 64 (1933): 41-65.

Baudy, G. J., *Exkommunikation und Reintegration: Zur Genese und Kulturfunktion frühgriechischer Einstellungen zum Tod* (Frankfurt, 1980).

Bauman, Richard, *Story, performance, and event* [*Cambridge Studies in Oral and Literate Culture* 10] (Cambridge, 1986).

Bers, Victor, *Speech in Speech: Studies in Incorporated Oratio Recta in Attic Drama and Oratory* (Lanham, 1997).

Binford, L. R., 'Mortuary practices: their study and their potential,' in James A. Brown, ed., *Approaches to the social dimensions of mortuary practices* [*Memoirs of the Society for American Archaeology* 25] (1971): 6-29.

Birdwhistell, R., *Kinesics and Context: Essays on Body Motion Communication* (Philadelphia, 1970).

Blauner, R., 'Death and Social Structure,' *Psychiatry* 29 (1966): 378-394.

Blundell, Mary Whitlock, *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics* (Cambridge, 1989).

Boas, M., *De Epigrammatis Simonideis, Pars Prior: Commentatio Critica de Epigrammatum Traditione* (Groningen, 1905).

Bowie, E. L., 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival,' *JHS* 106 (1986): 13-35.

Bowman, Alan K. and Greg Wolff, eds., *Literacy and Power in the ancient world* (Cambridge, 1994).

Bradeen, D. W., 'Athenian Casualty Lists,' *Hesperia* 33 (1964): 16-62.

—, 'The Athenian Casualty List of 464 B.C.,' *Hesperia* 36 (1967): 321-335.

—, 'The Athenian Casualty Lists,' *CQ* 19 (1969): 145-159.

—, *Inscriptions: The funerary monuments* [*The Athenian Agora* 17] (Princeton, 1974).

Bremer, D., *Licht und Dunkel in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Bonn, 1976).

Bremmer, Jan, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul* (Princeton, 1983).

Bremmer, Jan, and Hermann Roodenburg, eds., *A Cultural History of Gesture* (Ithaca, NY, 1992).

Burgoon, J., and T. Saine, *The Unspoken Dialogue: An Introduction to Nonverbal Communication* (Boston, 1978).

Bushnell, Rebecca W., *Prophesying Tragedy: Sign and Voice in Sophocles' Theban Plays* (Ithaca, NY, 1988).

Calder, W. M., 'Sophocles' Political Tragedy, *Antigone*,' *GRBS* 9 (1968): 389-407.

Cederroth, S. C., Corlin, and J. Lindström, eds., *On the Meaning of Death: Essays on Mortuary Rituals and Eschatological Beliefs* [*Uppsala Studies in Cultural Anthropology* 8] (Stockholm, 1988).

Cerri, Giovanni, 'Ideologia funeraria nell' Antigone di Sofocle,' in G. Gnoli and J. -P. Vernant, eds., *La mort, les morts, dans les sociétés anciennes* (Cambridge, 1982): 121-132.

—, *Legislazione orale e tragedia greca: Studi sull' Antigone di Sofocle e sulle Supplici di Euripide* (Naples, 1979).

Chapman, R., and K. Randsborg, 'Approaches to the archaeology of death,' in R. Chapmann, I. Kinnes, and K. Randsborg, eds., *The archaeology of death* (Cambridge, 1981).

Clairmont, C., *Gravestone and Epigram: Greek Memorials from the Archaic and Classical Period* (Mainz, 1970).

—, 'Gravestone and Epigram,' *Archäologisher Anzeiger* (1974): 219-238.

—, *Patrios Nomos: Public Burial at Athens During the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B. C.* 2 vols. (Oxford, 1983).

Claus, David B., '*Aidos* in the language of Achilles,' *TAPA* 105 (1975): 13-28.

Cramer, O. C., 'Speech and Silence in the *Iliad*,' *CJ* 71 (1976): 300-304.

Crotty, Kevin, *Song and Action: The Victory Odes of Pindar* (Baltimore, 1982).

Dalfen, J., 'Gesetz ist nicht Gesetz und Fromm ist nicht Fromm (die Sprache der Personen in der sophokleischen *Antigone*),' *WS* n. F. 11 (1977): 5-26.

Daux, G., 'Stèles funéraires et épigrammes (À propos d'un livre récent),' *BCH* 96 (1972): 503-566.

Day, J. W., 'Rituals in Stone: early Greek epigrams and monuments,' *JHS* 109 (1989): 16-28.

Descat, Raymond, 'Autour d'une fonction sociale de l'oralité: travail, échange et parole chez Pindare,' in Bruno Gentili and Giuseppe Paioni, eds., *Oralita: Cultura, Letteratura, Discorso* (Rome, 1985): 69-80.

Detienne, Marcel, ed., *Les Savoirs de l'Écriture en Grèce ancienne* (Lille, 1988).

Di Tillio, Zopito, 'Confronti formulari e lessicali tra le iscrizioni esametriche ed elegiache dal VII al V sec. a. C. e l'epos arcaico: I. Iscrizioni sepolcrali,' *QUCC* 7 (1969): 45-73.

Diepolder, Hans, *Die attischen Grabreliefs des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Darmstadt, 1965).

Dougherty, Carol, and Leslie Kurke, eds., *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece* (Cambridge, 1993).

Ducat, J., 'Fonctions de la statue dans la Grece archaique: kouros et kolossos,' *BCH* 100 (1976): 239-251.

Easterling, P. E., 'Men's *kleos* and Women's *goos*: Female Voices in the Iliad,' *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 9 (1991): 145-151.

Ecker, Ute, *Grabmal und Epigramm: Studien zur frühgriechischen Sepulkraldichtung* [*Palingenesia* XXIX] (Stuttgart, 1990).

Edmunds, Lowell, 'Thucydides in the act of writing,' in R. Pretagostini, ed., *Studi B. Gentili II* (Rome, 1993): 831-852.

Edwards, M. W., 'The Conventions of a Homeric Funeral,' *Studies in Honour of T. B Webster* (Bristol, 1987): 84-92.

Else, Gerald, *The Madness of Antigone* [*Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philos.-Histor.-Klass. Abhandlungen* pt. 1] (Heidelberg, 1976).

Enninger, W., and Ch. Schwens, 'Friedhöfe als kulturelle Texte,' *Zeitschrift für Semiotik* 11 (1989): 135-181.

Falkner, Thomas, *The Poetics of Old Age in Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy* (Norman, OK, 1995).

Fernandez, James, *Persuasions and Performances: The Play of Tropes in Culture* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1986).

Ferra, Maria Cannata, 'Peani, Ditirambi, Treni in Pind. Fr. 128c S.-M.,' *GIF* N. S. 32 (1980): 181-8.

Ferrari, F., 'Dizione epica e pianto rituale (*Iliade* 22, 405-436),' *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 12 (1984): 257-265.

Fine, Elizabeth C., *The Folklore Text: From Performance to Print* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1984).

—, and Jean Haskell Speer, eds., *Performance, Culture and Identity* (Westport, CT, 1992).
Finley, Moses I., *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500-200 B.C.: The Horos Inscriptions* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1985).
Finnegan, Ruth, *Oral Traditions and the Verbal Arts: A Guide to Research Practices* (London, 1992).
Flashar, Hellmut, *Der Epitaphios des Perikles, seine Funktion im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* [*SHAW* (1969)].
Floyd, Edwin D., '*Kleos aphthiton*: An Indo-European Perspective on Early Greek Poetry,' *Glotta* 58 (1980): 133-156.
Foley, Helene, 'Tragedy and Democratic Ideology: The Case of Sophocles' *Antigone*,' in Barbara Goff, *History, Tragedy, Theory: Dialogues on Athenian Drama* (Austin, 1995) 131-150.
Foley, J. M., 'Ancient Greek Studies and folkloristics,' *Journal of American Folklore* 107.425 (1994): 437-450.
—, *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1991).
—, *Oral-Formulaic Theory and Research: An Introduction and Annotated Bibliography* (New York, 1985).
—, ed., *Oral Tradition in Literature: Interpretation in Context* (Columbia, Missouri, 1986).
—, 'The Traditional Oral Audience,' *Balkan Studies* 18 (1977): 145-53.
—, 'Word-power, performance, and tradition,' *Journal of American Folklore* 105.417 (1992): 275-302.
Fowler, R. L., *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies* (Toronto, 1987).
Frawley, William, ed., *Linguistics and Literacy* (New York, 1982).
Friedländer, P., and H. B. Hoffleit, *Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars* (Berkeley, 1948).
Friedrich, Paul, and J. Redfield, 'Speech as a Personality Symbol: The Case of Achilles,' *Language* 54 (1978): 263-288.
Fulton, R., *Death and identity* (New York, 1976).
v. Gaertringen, F. Hiller, 'Perserepigramme von der athenischen Agora,' *Hermes* 69 (1934): 204-206.
Gaiser, K., *Das Staatsmodel des Thukydides. Zur Rede des Perikles für die Gefallenen* (Heidelberg, 1975).
Garland, R., 'Geras thanonton: An Investigation into the Claims of the Homeric Dead,' *BICS* 29 (1982): 69-80.
—, *The Greek Way of Death* (London, 1985).
—, 'The well-ordered corpse: an investigation into the motives behind Greek funerary legislation,' *BICS* 36 (1989): 1-15.
Gehrke, Hans-Joachim, *Jenseits von Athen und Sparta: Das dritte Griechenland und seine Staatenwelt* (Munich, 1986).
v. Gennep, A., *The rites of passage* (Chicago, 1977).
Gentili, Bruno, 'Epigramma ed Elegia,' *Entretiens Hardt* 14 (1967): 39-90.
—, and Giuseppe Paioni, eds., *Oralita: Cultura, Letteratura, Discorso* (Rome, 1985).
Gnoli, G., and J.-P. Vernant, eds., *La mort, les morts, dans les sociétés anciennes* (Cambridge, 1982).
Goheen, R. F., *The Imagery of Sophocles' Antigone: A Study of Poetic Language and Structure* (Princeton, 1951).
Goldhill, Simon, 'The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology,' in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin, eds., *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton, 1990): 97-129.
Gomme, A. W., *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, Books II-III* (Vol. II) (Oxford, 1956).
—, 'Herodotus and Marathon,' *Phoenix* 6 (1952): 77-83.
Goody, Jack, *The interface between the written and the oral* (Cambridge, 1987).
—, and Ian Watt, 'The Consequences of Literacy,' in J. R. Goody, ed., *Literacy in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge, 1968).
Griessmair, E., *Das Motiv der Mors Immatura in den griechischen metrischen Grabinschriften* (Innsbruck, 1966).

Griffin, J., 'Words and Speakers in Homer,' *JHS* 106 (1986): 36-57.

Gruber, M. I., *Aspects of Nonverbal Communication in the Ancient Near East* (Rome, 1980).

Guarducci, M., *Epigrafia greca* 4 vols. (Rome, 1967).

Hägg, R., *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B. C.: Tradition and Innovation* (Stockholm, 1983).

Häusle, Helmut, *Einfache und frühe Formen des griechischen Epigramms* [*Commentationes Aenipontane* XXV] (Innsbruck, 1979).

Häussler, R., 'λίνος ante Λίνον?' *RhM* 142 (1974): 1-14.

Hammond, N. G. L., 'The Campaign and the Battle of Marathon,' *JHS* 88 (1968): 13-57.

Hardwick, Lorna, 'Philomel and Pericles: silence in the funeral speech,' *G&R* 40 (1993): 147-162.

Harvey, A. E., 'The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry,' *CQ* 5 n.s. (1955): 157-174.

Hastings, H. R., *On the relation between inscriptions and sculptured representations on Attic tombstones* [*Bulletin of the UWisconsin* 485, Philology and Literature Series 5.2] (Madison, WI, 1912) 99-148.

Hathorn, R. Y., 'Sophocles' *Antigone*: Eros in Politics,' *CJ* 54 (1958-9) 109-115.

Hauvette, A., *De l'authenticité des épigrammes de Simonide* (Paris, 1896).

Havelock, E. A. and J. P. Hershbell, eds., *Communication Arts in the Ancient World* (New York, 1978).

Heinze, R., 'Von altgriechischen Kriegergräbern,' *Neue Jahrbücher* 35 (1915): 1-7.

Held, G. F., 'Antigone's Dual Motivation for the Double Burial,' *Hermes* 111 (1983): 190-201.

Henrich, Dieter and Wolfgang Iser, eds., *Funktionen des Fiktiven* (Munich, 1983).

Herfort-Koch, M., *Tod, Totenfürsorge, und Jenseitsvorstellungen in der griechischen Antike: Eine Bibliographie* (Munich, 1992).

Hertz, R., 'Contribution à une étude sur la représentation collective de la mort,' *L'Année sociologique* 10 (1907): 48-137.

Hester, D. A., 'Law and Piety in the *Antigone* (A Reply to J. Dalfen: Gesetz ist nicht Gesetz...),' *WS* N.F. 14 (1980): 5-8.

—, 'Sophocles the Unphilosophical: A Study in the *Antigone*,' *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, 24, (1971): 11-59.

Hogan, J., 'The Protagonists of the *Antigone*,' *Arethusa* 5 (1972): 93-100.

Holst-Warhaft, Gail, *Dangerous Voices: women's laments and Greek literature* (London, 1992).

Hooker, J. T., 'Χάρις and ἀρετή in Thucydides,' *Hermes* 102 (1974): 164-9.

Hubbard, Thomas K., *The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry* (Leiden, 1985).

Humphreys, S. C., 'Family tombs and tomb cult in ancient Athens: tradition or traditionalism?' *JHS* 100 (1980): 96-126.

—, *The Family, Women, and Death* (London, 1983).

—, and Helen King, eds., *Mortality and Immortality: the Anthropology and Archaeology of Death* (London, 1982): 261-283.

Huntington, R., and P. Metcalf, *Celebrations of Death: The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual* (Cambridge, 1979).

Iser, Wolfgang, *The Fictive and the Imaginary: Charting Literary Anthropology* (Baltimore, 1993).

Jacoby, F.,'ΓΕΝΕΣΙΑ: A Forgotten Festival of the Dead,' *CQ* 38 (1944): 65-75.

—, 'Patrios Nomos: State Burial in Athens and the Public Cemetary in the Kerameikos,' *JHS* 64 (1944): 37-66.

Jeffery, L. H., 'The inscribed gravestones of archaic Attica,' *BSA* 57 (1962): 115-153.

—, *The local scripts of archaic Greece* (Oxford, 1961).

—, 'Some early Greek epitaphs,' *GaR* 16 (1947): 127-132.

Johansen, K. F., *The Attic Grave Reliefs of the Classical Period* (Copenhagen, 1951).

Junghahn, A. A., 'De Simonidis Cei epigrammatis quaestiones,' *Vierter Jahresbericht über das Luisenstädtische Gymnasium in Berlin* (1869): 3-41.

Kaibel, G., 'Quaestiones Simonideae,' *RhM* N.F. 28 (1873): 436-460.

Kakridis, J. Th., 'Epitaphiosinterpretationen,' *WS* 56 (1939): 17-26.
—, 'Die Niobesage bei Homer,' *RhM* 79 (1930): 113-122.
—, *Der thukydideische Epitaphios* [*Zetemata* 26] (Munich, 1961).
Kallet-Marx, Lisa, 'Thuc. 2.45.2 and the status of war widows in Periclean Athens,' in R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell, eds., *Nomodeiktes: Studies in honor of M. Ostwald* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1993): 133-143.
Knox, B. M. W., *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* [*Sather Classical Lectures* 35] (Berkeley, 1964).
Kohl, W., 'Zur Eulogie der Gefallenen (Thukydides 2,42,4),' *Gymnasium* 85 (1978): 128-143.
Koonce, Dorothy Marie, 'Formal Lamentation For the Dead in Greek Tragedy.' Diss. University of Pennsylvania, 1962.
Koselleck, R., 'Kriegerdenkmale als Identitätsstiftungen der Überlebenden,' in O. Marquard and K. Stierle, eds., *Identität* (Munich, 1979): 255-276.
Kullmann, Wolfgang, *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen* [*ScriptOralia* 30] (Tübingen, 1990).
Kurke, Leslie, *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca, NY, 1991).
Kurtz, D. C., and John Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs* (London, 1971).
Labarbe, Jules, 'Les aspects gnomiques de l'épigramme grecque,' *Entretiens Hardt* 14 (1967): 351-386.
Landmann, G. P., 'Das Lob Athens in der Grabrede des Perikles (Thukydides II 34-41),' *Mus. Helv.* 31 (1974): 65-95.
Latacz, Joachim, ed., *Homer: Tradition und Neuerung* (Darmstadt, 1979).
Lateiner, Donald, 'Heroic Proxemics: Social Space and Distance in the *Odyssey*,' *TAPA* 122 (1992): 133-163.
—, *Sardonic Smile: nonverbal behavior in Homeric epic* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1995).
Lattimore, Richmond, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana, 1962).
Lausberg, M., *Das Einzel-Distichon: Studien zum antiken Epigramm* (*Studia et testimonia antiqua* 19) (Munich, 1982).
Lloyd-Jones, Hugh, 'Pindar and the After-life,' *Entretiens Hardt* 31 (1985): 245-283.
Lonsdale, S., *Dance and Ritual Play in Greek Religion* (Baltimore, 1993).
Loraux, N., 'La belle mort spartiate,' *Ktema* 2 (1977): 105-120.
—, *The Experiences of Tiresias: The Feminine and the Greek Man* (Princeton, 1995).
—, 'HBH et ANΔPEIA: Deux versions de la mort du combattant athénien,' *Anc. Soc.* 6 (1975): 1-31.
—, *The invention of Athens: The funeral oration in the Classical city* (Cambridge, MA, 1986).
—, 'Marathon ou l'Histoire idéologique,' *REA* 75 (1973): 13-42.
Lord, Albert B., *Epic Singers and Oral Tradition* (Ithaca, NY, 1991).
—, 'Homer as Oral Poet,' *HSCP* 72 (1968): 1-46.
—, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, MA, 1960).
Lowenstam, Steven, *The Death of Patroklos: A Study in Typology* (Königstein/Ts., 1981).
Lynn-George, M., 'Structures of care in the *Iliad*,' *GRBS* 46.1 (1996): 1-26.
Mackay, Anne, 'Time and Timelessness in the Traditions of Early Greek Oral Poetry and Archaic Vase-Painting,' *Voice Into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*, ed. Ian Worthington (Leiden, 1996): 43-58.
MacLachlan, Bonnie, *The Age of Grace: Charis in Early Greek Poetry* (Princeton, 1993).
Martin, Richard, *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Ithaca, NY, 1989).
Mawet, Fr., 'Epigrammes, threnes et dithyrambes: les lamentations funebres de l'épopée,' *Le monde grec: hommages à Claire Preaux* ed. J. Bingen, G. Cambier, and G. Nachtergael (Brussels, 1975): 33-44.
—, *Recherches sur les oppositions fonctionelles dans le vocabulaire homérique de la douleur (autour de πῆμα-ἄλγος)* (Brussels, 1979).
Meiggs, Russell, and David Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1969).

Meritt, B. D., 'Epigrams from the Battle of Marathon,' in Saul S. Weinberg, ed., *The Aegean and the Near East: Studies presented to H. Goldman* (1956): 268-280.
—, 'The Marathon Epigrams Again,' *AJP* 83 (1962): 294-8.
Miller, M., 'Greek Kinship Terminology,' *JHS* 73 (1953): 46-52.
Molyneux, John H., *Simonides: A Historical Study* (Wauconda, IL, 1992).
Monsacré, Hélène, *Les larmes d'Achille: Les héros, la femme et la souffrance dans la poésie d'Homère* (Paris, 1984).
Moranti, M., 'Formule metriche nelle iscrizioni greche arcaiche,' *QUCC* 13 (1972): 7-23.
Morris, Ian, 'Attitudes toward Death in archaic Greece,' *ClassAnt* 8 (1989): 296-320.
—, *Burial and Ancient Society: The Rise of the Greek City State* (Cambridge, 1987).
—, *Death-Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1992).
Müller, C. W., 'Der schöne Tod des Polisbürgers oder "Ehrenvoll ist es, für das Vaterland zu sterben,"' *Gymnasium* 96 (1989): 317-340.
Muellner, Leonard C., *The Meaning of Homeric εὔχομαι through its formulas* [*Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 13] (Innsbruck, 1976).
Muth, R., "Hymenaios' und "Epithalamion,"' *WS* 67 (1954): 5-45.
Nagler, Michael N., *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer* (Berkeley, 1974).
Nagy, Gregory, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore, 1979).
—, *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore, 1990).
—, *Poetry as performance: Homer and beyond* (Cambridge, 1996).
—, 'Sema and Noesis: The Hero's Tomb and the "Reading" of Symbols in Homer and Hesiod,' *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca, NY, 1990): 202-222.
Nagy, Joseph F., 'Hierarchy, Heroes, and Heads: Indo-European Structures in Greek Myth,' in Lowell Edmunds, ed., *Approaches to Greek Myth* (Baltimore, 1990): 199-238.
Neuberg, Matt, 'How Like a Woman: Antigone's "Inconsistency,"' *CQ* 40 (1990): 54-76.
G. Neumann, 'Zum Verhältnis von Grabdenkmal und Grabinschrift in der archaischen und klassischen Zeit Griechenlands,' in H. Brunner, R. Kannicht, and K. Schwager, *Wort und Bild: Symposion des Fachbereichs Altertums- u. Kulturwissenschaften zum 500jährigen Jubiläum der Eberhard-Karls-Univ. Tübingen* (Munich, 1979).
Nimis, Steven, 'The Language of Achilles: Construction vs. Representation,' *CW* 79 (1986): 217-225.
Ober, Josiah, 'Greek Horoi: Artifactual Texts and the Contingency of Meaning,' in David B. Small, ed., *Methods in the Mediterranean: Historical and Archaeological Views on Texts and Archaeology* (Leiden, 1995): 91-123.
—, 'Thucydides' Criticism of Democratic Knowledge,' in R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell, eds., *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1993): 81-98.
—, and B. Strauss, 'Drama, Political Rhetoric, and the Discourse of Athenian Democracy,' in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin, eds., *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton, 1990): 237-270.
Oliver, J. H., 'The Marathon epigrams,' *AJP* 56 (1935): 193-201.
Ong, Walter J., *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London, 1982).
Osborne, R. G., 'Death revisited, death revised: the death of the artist in archaic and classical Greece,' *Art History* 11 (1988): 1-16.
Oudemans, Th. C. W., and A. P. M. H. Lardinois, *Tragic Ambiguity: Anthropology, Philosophy, and Sophocles' Antigone* (Leiden, 1987).
Page, D. L., 'Archilochus and the Oral Tradition,' *Entretiens Hardt* 10 (1964): 117-179.
—, *Epigrammata Graeca* (Oxford, 1975).
—, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1981).
Parker, R., *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford, 1983).
Parks, Ward, *Verbal dueling in heroic narrative: the Homeric and Old English traditions* (Princeton, 1990).
Parry, Adam, 'The language of Achilles,' *TAPA* 84 (1956): 124-134.

—, *Logos and ergon in Thucydides* (New York, 1981).
—, 'Thucydides' Use of Abstract Language,' *Language as Action: Yale French Studies* 45 (1970): 3-20.
Parry, Milman, *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, ed. Adam Parry (Oxford, 1971).
Pearson, L., 'Three Notes on the Funeral Oration of Pericles,' *AJP* 64 (1943): 399-407.
Peek, W., 'Zu den Perser-Epigrammen,' *Hermes* 88 (1960): 494-9.
Peppmüller, R. H., *Über die Komposition der Klagelieder im vierundzwanzigsten Buch der Ilias* (Halle, 1876).
—, *De extrema Iliadis Rhapsodia* (Halle, 1868).
Petersmann, G., 'Die monologische Totenklage der *Ilias*,' *RhM* 116 (1973): 3ff.
Petropoulou, A., 'The Interment of Patroklos (*Il.* 23.252-7),' *AJP* 109 (1988): 482-495.
M. Pfanner, 'Zur Schmückung griechischer Grabstelen,' *HASB* 3 (1977): 5-15.
Pfohl, G., 'Das anonyme Epigramm. Methoden der Erschliessung poetischer Inschriften, dargestellt am Model der griechischen Grabinschriften,' *Euphrosyne* N. S. 4 (1970): 73-112.
—, ed., *Greek Poems on Stones, I, Epitaphs: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries B. C.* (Leiden, 1967).
Philipp, H., *Tektonon Daidala: Der bildende Künstler und sein Werk im vorplatonischen Schrifttum* (Berlin, 1968).
Podlecki, Anthony J., 'Polis and Monarch in Early Attic Tragedy,' in J. Peter Euben, ed., *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory* (Berkeley, 1986): 76-100.
Poyatos, Fernando, *Advances in Nonverbal Communication: Sociocultural, Clinical, Esthetic, and Literary Perspectives* (Amsterdam, 1992).
Pritchett, W. Kendrick, *The Greek State at War* 5 vols. (Berkeley, 1971-1985).
—, *Marathon* (Berkeley, 1960).
Raaflaub, Kurt, *Die Entdeckung der Freiheit* (Munich, 1985).
Raible, W. ed., *Zwischen Festtag und Alltag: Zehn Beiträge zum Thema 'Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit'* (Tübingen, 1988).
Raubitschek, A. E., 'Das Denkmal-Epigram,' *Entretiens Hardt* 14 (1967): 3-26.
—, 'Die Inschrift als geschichtliches Denkmal,' *Gymnasium* 72 (1965): 511-522.
Redfield, J. M., *Nature and culture in the Iliad* (Chicago, 1975).
Reece, Steve, *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1993).
Rehm, Rush, *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton, 1994).
Reiner, E., *Die rituelle Totenklage der Griechen* (Stuttgart, 1938).
Richardson, N., *The Iliad: A Commentary Vol. VI: books 21-24* (Cambridge, 1993).
Richter, G. M. A., *The Archaic Gravestones of Attica* (London, 1961).
Robb, Kevin, *Literacy and Paideia in Ancient Greece* (Oxford, 1994).
Roberts, Deborah, 'The Frustrated Mourner: Strategies of Closure in Greek Tragedy,' in R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell, eds., *Nomodeiktes: Studies in honor of M. Ostwald* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1993): 573-589.
Rösler, W., *Dichter und Gruppe: Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios* (Munich, 1980).
—, 'Persona reale o persona poetica? L'interpretazione dell' "io" nella lirica greca,' *QUCC* 19 (1985): 131-144.
—, 'Über Deixis und einige Aspekte mündlichen und schriftlichen Stils in antiker Lyrik,' *Würzburger Jahrbücher* N.F. 9 (1983): 7-28.
Rohdich, Hermann, *Antigone: Beitrag zu einer Theorie des sophokleischen Helden* (Heidelberg, 1980).
Rosenblatt, P.C., R. P. Walsh, and D. A. Jackson, *Grief and Mourning in Cross-cultural Perspective* (1976).
Rosivach, Vincent, 'On Creon, Antigone, and not Burying the Dead,' *RhM* 126 (1983): 193-211.
—, 'The Two Worlds of the *Antigone*,' *ICS* 4 (1979): 16-26.

Rusten, J.S., ed., *Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War Book II* (Cambridge, 1989).
—, 'Two lives or three? Pericles on the Athenian character (Thuc. 2.40.2),' *CQ* 35 (1985): 14-19.
—, 'Structure, style, and sense in interpreting Thucydides: the solidier's choice (Thuc. 2.42.4),' *HSCP* 90 (1986): 49-76.
Schaps, David, 'The woman least mentioned,' *CQ* 27 (1977): 323-330.
Schneidewin, F. W., 'Über ein neuentdecktes Bruchstück eines Pindarischen Threnos,' *RhM* 2 (1834): 110-121.
Seaford, Richard *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State* (Oxford, 1994).
Sealey, Raphael, 'The Origins of *Demokratia*,' *ClasAnt* 6 (1973): 253-295.
Segal, Charles 'Andromache's Anagnorisis: Formulaic Artistry in *Iliad* 22.437-476,' *HSCP* 75 (1971): 33-57.
—, 'Sophocles' Praise of Man and the Conflicts of the *Antigone*,' in T. Woodard, ed., *Sophocles: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1966).
—, *Sophocles' Tragic World: Divinity, Nature, Society* (Cambridge, MA, 1995).
—, *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse* [*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 17 (1971)].
—, *Tragedy and Civilization: An Interpretation of Sophocles* (Cambridge, MA, 1981).
Shapiro, H. A., 'The Iconography of Mourning in Athenian Art,' *AJA* 95.4 (1991): 629-656.
Siurla-Theodoridou, V., *Die Familie in der griechischen Kunst und Literatur des 8. bis 6. Jahrhunderts* (*Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt* 4) (Munich, 1989).
Smith, G., 'Athenian Causalty Lists,' *CP* 14 (1919): 351-364.
Sorum, Christina Elliot, 'The Family in Sophocles' *Antigone* and *Electra*,' *CW* 75 (1981-2): 201-211.
Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane, 'Assumptions and the Creation of Meaning: Reading Sophocles' *Antigone*,' *JHS* 109 (1989): 134-148.
—, '*Reading' Greek Death: To the end of the Classical Period* (Oxford, 1995).
Stahl, H.-P., *Thukydides: Die Stellung des Menschen im geschichtlichen Prozeß* [*Zetemata* 40] (Munich, 1966).
Starr, Chester G., *The Awakening of the Greek Historical Spirit* (New York, 1968).
Stecher, A., *Inschriftliche Grabgedichte auf Krieger und Athleten: Eine Studie zu griechischen Wertprädikationen* (Innsbruck, 1981).
Steiner, Deborah Tarn, *The Tyrant's Writ: Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece* (Princeton, 1994).
Strasburger, H., 'Thukydides und die politische Selbstdarstellung der Athener,' *Hermes* 86 (1958): 17-40.
Svenbro, J., *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca, NY, 1993).
Vermeule, Emily, *Aspects of Death in early Greek art and poetry* (Berkeley, 1979).
Vernant, J.-P., *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays* ed. Froma I. Zeitlin (Princeton, 1991).
—, *Mythe et société en Greèce ancienne* (Paris, 1974).
Vidal-Naquet, Pierre, 'La Tradition de l'Hoplite Athénien,' in J.-P. Vernant, ed., *Problèmes de la guerre en Grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1963).
Walcot, P., 'The funeral speech, a study of values,' *G&R* 20 (1975) 111-121.
Wallace, M. B., 'Notes on early Greek grave epigrams,' *Phoenix* 24 (1970): 95-105.
Welwei, K. W., 'Die 'Marathon Epigramme von der athenischen Agora,' *Historia* 19 (1970): 299-303.
West, M. L., *Studies in Greek elegy and iambus* (Berlin, 1974).
Whaley, J., ed., *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death* (London, 1981).
Wiedemann, T. J., 'ἐλάχιστον... ἐν τοῖς ἄρσεσι κλέος: Thucydides, women and the limits of rational analysis,' *G&R* 30 (1983): 163-170.
Zeitlin, Froma I., 'Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama,' in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin, eds., *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton, 1990): 130-167.
Zuntz, Günther, *Persephone: Three Essays on Religion and Thought in Magna Graecia* (Oxford, 1971).

GENERAL INDEX

Achilles 15, 25, 34, 44, 46, 52-57, 60-61, 92, 193-194 *See also*: protagonist(s)
activity (active response to death) 10, 17, 21-24, 51-52, 58, 61, 63, 82-83, 85, 95-98, 101-103, 107-108, 110, 112, 114-116, 121, 131, 134n65, 143, 156, 164, 166, 172, 175-176, 179, 192-193
Aeschylus 138-139
aesthetics 13, 77, 82-83, 85-86, 94, 112, 115
afterlife 116, 120, 122-126, 159
aggression 16-18
agon 117, 164-166, 168-169, 173, 178, 188-189, 194
Ajax 138, 141-142
Andromache 34, 38, 42-45, 48-50, 55
anger 16
anticipated death 21-22, 25, 35, 48
Antigone 138, 140, 144, 146-158, 194 *See also*: protagonist(s)
Archilochus 66-67
Ares 80, 97, 101
Astyanax 38, 45, 48-49 *See also*: father and son
Athens 70-72, 102-107, 109-110, 157, 162-166, 173-181, 185-188, 192-193 *See also*: polis, state

'beautiful death' 42, 68, 85, 90-91, 97, 99, 114-116, 156, 166-167 *See also*: καλὸς θάνατος
birth 36, 39, 47, 62, 191
boasting 15, 18, 41-42, 56
Briseis 30, 34n76, 46, 47n130, 52
burial 4, 27, 61, 138, 140, 145, 147-148, 150, 154, 156-157, 161, 166, 192

casualty lists 102, 116
chronological motifs 4, 25, 36-37, 39, 47, 49, 56, 59, 107, 114, 120, 126, 166-167, 178-180, 193 *See also*: νῦν
civic burial 64, 112, 116, 128, 161
collectivity 4, 13-14, 17, 19-22, 24-25, 27, 51-52, 61, 73-74, 77, 88-90, 93, 96-97, 99-103, 107, 112, 133, 158-160, 170-171, 176, 179-180, 184, 187, 189, 191, 193-194
communicative memory 51, 61, 192 *See also*: cultural memory, memory
corpse 28
Creon 140, 144-147, 149-158
cry 28 *See also*: κώκυειν
cultural memory 51-52, 61, 91, 93-94 *See also*: memory, μνῆμα

death *See*: anticipated death, 'beautiful death,' extraordinary death, warriors and warriors' death
death ritual 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 29-30, 34-35, 37, 55, 64-67, 79, 84, 91, 114, 116, 121, 135-136, 138, 140, 143, 145, 153, 158, 189, 191, 193
democracy 111-113, 171, 181, 185-187
Demosthenes 162-163, 168-169, 172, 184, 186-187
departure (of death) 46, 59, 119, 121, 131, 134n65, 138, 141, 145, 166-167, 193 *See also*: λείπειν
desire (for γόος) 35 *See also*: satisfaction (of desire for γόος)
disfigurement (of the mourner) 26, 28-29, 53, 142
dithyramb 118-119
domestic setting 25, 32-33, 40-41, 44, 46, 47n124, 49, 141
donor (of the grave epigram / stele) 72, 83-87, 94, 98, 102, 110, 112, 115
durability (of the epigram) 74, 94-96, 112, 114, 191
duty, ritual *See*: ritual duty

elegy 66-71, 90-91, 96, 120-122, 194
elite 74, 111-113
Elpenor 50
embrace of the dead 29, 53
epic 10, 15, 24-25, 31-32, 42-46, 51-52, 60-61, 63, 79, 90-91, 95-96, 100-101, 115, 117, 122, 192 *See also*: Homeric poems
epitaphios logos 14, 70, 116-117, 140, 161-188, 190-194
Eteocles 153
Eurydice 147, 150, 154-155, 157-158
Euripides 137-138
exchange 13, 68, 84, 191 *See also*: reciprocity
extraordinary death 62, 67, 75-76, 88-89, 94, 97-98, 114, 146-147, 151, 171, 193 *See also*: warriors and warriors' death, youth

family *See*: kin

father and son 38-39, 46, 50, 60-61, 146 and 146n105
female mourning *See*: women and women's mourning
first person epigrams 77-78, 96, 115
flyting 41-42 *See also*: boasting
formula(e) 45-46, 49, 56, 61, 64, 72, 82, 86, 88-90, 99, 101, 108, 110
funeral oration of Pericles (Thuc. 2.35-46) 14, 161-163, 166-167, 170-171, 173-180, 183-185, 189-190 *See also*: epitaphios logos
funerary legislation 65-66, 69, 70, 112, 135-136

genealogy 100-101, 120
gender 9, 16, 24-25, 44, 145, 147, 171 *See also*: men and men's mourning, women and women's mourning
geographic locations 101-103, 109, 112, 114, 131, 134, 158, 174, 177-178, 180, 188, 191
gesture(s) 7, 23, 25, 32, 43, 50, 54-55, 65, 137, 140 *See also*: embrace of the dead, seated posture
gods 18, 44, 48n131, 49, 80, 90, 104, 106-108, 110, 120, 124-125, 138, 152
Gorgias 162-163
grave epigrams 6, 11-13, 63-64, 66, 70-72, 76-100, 103, 114, 116-117, 120, 122, 127-137, 153, 159, 164, 173, 178, 190-194
grave marker 49, 62, 70-71, 75-76, 86-88, 94, 112, 115, 140, 174 *See also*: σῆμα, τύμβος
grief 3, 16-18, 20, 23-24, 66, 87, 89, 135, 143

Hades 80, 91
Haemon 147, 154-157
Hecabe 34, 44, 55
Hector 34-35, 38, 43-46, 48-50, 55, 57, 138
Helen 34 and 34n75, 44, 47n130, 48n132
hero(es), heroic code 10, 15, 17-19, 22, 24-25, 32, 34, 36-44, 48-61, 63, 90, 92-93, 101, 108, 115, 118, 123-124, 132, 137, 148-149, 193
hero cult 128
Herodotus 127-130, 132-134, 136, 190
history 5-6, 13-14, 62, 64, 77, 96, 101, 103, 106-107, 109-110, 112, 114, 159, 162, 164, 169, 171, 173-175, 178-179, 181-182, 188, 190-192, 194
homeostasis 107, 110, 112, 114
Homeric poems 5, 9-11, 15, 17, 32, 41, 49, 61, 63-64, 67, 80, 83, 85, 94, 96, 101, 106, 109, 114, 116-117, 119-121, 131, 137-138, 140-142, 144-145, 173, 191-194 *See also*: epic
house *See*: domestic setting
Hyperides 162, 172, 187

identity *See*: stable identity
individuality 4, 10, 13-14, 17, 19-22, 24-25, 29, 51-52, 61, 74, 77, 89, 96-97, 99-103, 107, 112, 116-117, 128, 132-133, 136-137, 139, 145, 154-155, 157-160, 164-165, 168-171, 174-180, 184, 188-191, 193
initiation 3 *See also*: rites of passage, transition

Kallinus 67
kin, kinship 4, 17, 19, 22, 25, 35-36, 40, 44, 47n130, 48, 55, 69, 76-77, 79, 82, 85, 88, 94, 97, 99-100, 102, 110, 112, 114, 149, 151
kindness 47n130

Laertes 60 *See also*: father and son
lament 8-12, 15-17, 23-25, 30-31, 37-38, 40-44, 47-51, 55-57, 59-60, 62-63, 66-69, 92, 94-95, 98, 114-120, 122, 135-139, 142, 144-145, 147, 153-155, 157, 159, 164-165, 169, 171-174, 178, 188, 191, 193-194
literacy 6-7, 11, 93, 95, 159, 165, 189, 192
literary epitaphs 70
Lysias 162-163, 167, 171-172, 186-187
lyric 91

male mourning *See*: men and male mourning
Marathon 103-106, 109
marriage 39, 47, 49, 62, 79, 88, 145, 147, 155, 191
'marriage to death' 147-148
memory 15, 27 and 27n54, 58-59, 61, 73, 83, 91, 112, 114, 181, 194 *See also*: cultural memory, μνῆμα
men and male mourning 15, 17-19, 22, 24, 27-30, 40-41, 51, 53-56, 60, 62, 65, 70, 106-107, 143-144, 146, 158
Megistias (Simonides 6 Page) 116, 127-132, 134
Menelaus 60
Mimnermus 121
mourning 3-5, 14-17, 21, 23, 36, 51, 53, 58-60, 65, 67, 76, 87-89, 95, 99, 102, 110, 115, 117, 128, 135-136, 138-

139, 145, 147, 155, 163, 165, 168-171, 174, 188, 192-194 *See also*: death ritual
Muses 118-119
mutilation (of the corpse) 42, 55, 154

name (of the dead) 10, 12, 47, 50, 62, 70-72, 82, 86, 94, 96, 98, 110, 114, 174, 185-187, 193
name (of survivors and mourners) 38, 86, 94, 98, 110

Odysseus 15, 21-22, 32, 34-35, 39, 49-50, 52-53, 58-61, 138, 194 *See also*: protagonist(s)
Oedipus 137-138
onomatopoieia 81
oppositions 62, 120, 145
'oralcy' 6-7, 11, 13-14, 96, 117, 139, 189
orality 6-7, 10-13, 63-64, 70, 74, 77, 86, 90, 93, 96, 103, 112-117, 126-127, 133-134, 152, 159, 164-165, 181-182, 186-192
Orpheus 119

paian 118-119
passivity 40 *See also*: activity (active response to death)
Patroclus 15, 22, 30, 32, 34, 46, 52-57, 61, 138
Peloponnesian War 161
Penelope 15, 34, 39, 49, 53, 60
performance 5, 7-8, 15-16, 30-31, 35-37, 41, 44, 46, 52, 55-56, 63, 69, 86, 115, 117, 119, 126, 137, 143, 146, 158, 163-166, 175, 177, 181-182, 188, 192
Persian Wars 70, 104-105, 109, 114, 176
Persian War epigrams 64, 102-110
Phrasikleia (CEG 24) 80, 149, 170
Pindar 66, 92, 117-127, 159, 188, 190-191, 194
Plato 117, 162-163, 169, 172, 184, 186
Plutarch 173
polis 69, 85, 100, 139-140, 146-147, 150-154, 156-159, 166, 168, 175-188, 190, 192, 194; political role of writing, 110-111 *See also*: Athens, state
political discourse 152-153, 158-159, 163-164, 171-173, 185-190
pollution 147, 150-151, 157
Polyneices 147, 150-151, 153-154, 156-158
polysemy (of gravemarkers) 51-52, 61, 128, 190
praise and praise poetry 12, 14, 91, 93, 101, 172-173, 175 and 175n34, 176, 178-179, 182-183, 188
Priam 17, 35, 46, 57
private mourning *See*: individuality
professional lament 66, 117, 125, 159 *See also*: θρῆνος, Pindar
protagonist(s) 15, 32, 53-57, 60-61, 145, 194
public ritual *See*: collectivity

reading 11-12, 76-78, 80-81, 87, 89, 94-96, 99, 101-102, 107, 112, 115
reciprocity 67, 77, 83-86, 93-95, 97, 102, 112, 115, 117, 158, 172-173, 183-185, 188, 190-192 *See also*: exchange
refentiality 7-8, 16, 32, 46, 61, 71, 86, 90-91, 96, 99, 106-108, 192 *See also*: formula(e), topoi, type scenes
reincarnation 124-125
revenge 17-19, 21-22, 24, 33, 40-41, 55, 63, 139, 191
rite(s) of passage 79, 94, 114, 191
ritual duty 17, 26, 30, 157-158, 184 *See also*: γέρας θανόντων

Salamis 104-106
satisfaction (of desire for γόος) 30, 32-33 *See also*: desire (for γόος)
sculptor (of a stele) 84, 94
seated posture 23, 29, 40n103
second person epigrams 80, 94, 96, 115
separation by death 38 *See also*: departure
sight *See*: visual motifs
Simonides 66, 116, 127-132
skolion 70
Solon 66, 70
Sophocles 79, 116, 136-145, 188-189
soul 33
spatial limitation (of epigram) 73-74, 95-96, 114
spontaneous lament 27, 31-2
stable identity (of the dead) 4, 10, 14, 37, 39, 66, 79, 93-95, 107, 114, 120, 122, 191, 194
state 149-150, 158, 177 *See also*: Athens, polis
stelai 70, 83, 104 *See also*: grave marker

'talking stone(s)' 79, 94
tears 23, 29, 58, 142 *See also*: weeping
Telemachus 15, 21-22, 34, 39, 50, 59-60, 92
Thermopylae 128, 133-134, 136, 159
Thetis 18, 34
third person epigrams 82ff., 94, 115
Thucydides 161-167, 170-171, 173-187, 189-190, 194

time *See*: chronological motifs
topoi 161, 165-166, 188
tragedy 79, 116, 136-140, 142, 194
transition 4, 74-75 *See also*: initiation, rites of passage
type scenes 53, 61
Tyrtaeus 67

underworld 122, 124 *See also*: afterlife

visual motifs 17, 27-28, 51, 53, 64, 73, 78, 85, 90, 95-96, 115, 143, 145, 154, 173

warrior(s) and warriors' death 13, 17, 67, 76, 80, 85, 87n80 and n82, 88-90, 92, 94, 97-103, 106-109, 114-117, 130, 133, 134n65, 146-147, 149, 172, 175, 178, 183-184, 192-193
wedding song 118-119
weeping 16, 22, 53-54, 90 *See also*: tears
wish(es) 37, 47-49, 138
women and women's mourning 15, 24-25, 28-33, 39-41, 48, 51, 53, 55-56, 60, 62-63, 65-66, 86, 115, 139-141, 143-146, 158, 169-170 *See also*: gender
writing 7, 11-13, 62-63, 66, 70, 74, 76-77, 86, 93, 107, 109-110, 112-117, 127, 190, 193

youth 76, 92, 114

INDEX OF GREEK TERMS

ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός 91, 93
ἄχνυσθαι 16-25, 46, 63 *See also*: ἄχος
ἄχος 17n6, 22, 24, 51-52, 60, 142-145, 191 *See also*: ἄχνυσθαι
γέρας θανόντων 27, 34, 84, 90-91, 156, 190-191 *See also*: ritual duty
γόος 8-10, 16, 20, 22-25, 28, 30-50, 53, 55-57, 63, 69, 76, 79-81, 85, 97, 114, 119, 122, 131, 135-136, 140-144, 173 *See also*: lament
δημοκρατία 170, 185-186, 193
δῆμος 75, 85, 97
δημόσιον σῆμα 161 *See also*: civic burial
ἔργον 163-164, 166-167, 181-188, 192
ἑταῖρος 17-20, 22, 41, 75
θρῆνος 31, 66, 137, 140-142 *See also*: Pindar, professional lament
θυμός 19, 23
ἰάχειν 16
καλὸς θάνατος 148-149, 154 *See also*: 'beautiful death'
κηδεμόνες 19, 22
κῆρ 19
κλαίειν, κλαυθμός 16, 20, 23-32, 34n76, 46, 142 *See also*: lament
κλαυθμός *See*: κλαίειν
κλέος 10, 21-22, 32, 39, 42-44, 49-53, 55, 57, 59-61, 67, 69, 80, 90, 95, 103, 106-108, 110, 130, 132, 134n65, 140, 148-149, 170, 172-173, 178, 185-186, 190, 192
κραδίη 19
κωκύειν, κωκυτός 16, 28n56, 143-145, 154 *See also*: cry
λείπειν 46, 119, 121, 131, 145 *See also*: departure, separation
λόγος 163-164, 166-167, 181-188, 192
μινυρίζειν 16
μνῆμα 73, 77-78, 82, 95, 114, 126, 156 *See also*: cultural memory, memory
μύρεσθαι 16, 26, 29
νόστος 15, 33, 53, 58-61
νῦν 36, 46, 49, 56-57, 59, 120 *See also*: chronological motifs
ὀδύρεσθαι 16-17, 20, 22-24, 32, 46
οἰμωγή 28n56, 143-145
σῆμα 10, 15, 30-31, 49-52, 55, 61, 63, 67, 72-74, 77-80, 82-84, 90-91, 94-95, 99, 104, 114
στενάχειν, στεναχίζειν, στοναχή 20, 23, 26-27, 29, 31-32, 34n76, 143-144
τέρψις 33, 68-69, 117, 121-123, 135, 159, 168, 194
τύμβος 49-52
φιλία 155-156
φίλος 46, 85, 99, 149, 151, 156
φρήν 19
χάρις 84-85, 172, 191 *See also*: exchange, reciprocity

This page intentionally left blank

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY H. PINKSTER, H.W. PLEKET
C.J. RUIJGH, D.M. SCHENKEVELD AND P.H. SCHRIJVERS

Recent volumes in the series:

190. Hout, M.P.J. van den. *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10957 9
191. Kraus, C. Shuttleworth (ed.). *The Limits of Historiography.* Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10670 7
192. Lomas, K. & T. Cornell. *Cities and Urbanisation in Ancient Italy.* ISBN 90 04 10808 4 *In preparation*
193. Malkin, I. *History of Greek Colonization.* ISBN 90 04 09843 7 *In preparation*
194. Wood, S.E. *Imperial Women.* A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C. - A.D. 68. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11281 2
195. Ophuijsen, J.M. van & P. Stork. *Linguistics into Interpretation.* Speeches of War in Herodotus VII 5 & 8-18. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11455 6
196. Tsetskhladze, G.R. (ed.). *Ancient Greeks West and East.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 11190 5
197. Pfeijffer, I.L. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar.* A Commentary on *Nemean* V, *Nemean* III, & *Pythian* VIII. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11381 9
198. Horsfall, N. *Virgil,* Aeneid 7. A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10842 4
199. Irby-Massie, G.L. *Military Religion in Roman Britain.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10848 3
200. Grainger, J.D. *The League of the Aitolians.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10911 0
201. Adrados, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable.* I: Introduction and from the Origins to the Hellenistic Age. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11454 8
202. Grainger, J.D. *Aitolian Prosopographical Studies.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11350 9
203. Solomon, J. *Ptolemy* Harmonics. Translation and Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 115919
204. Wijsman, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus Argonautica, Book VI.* A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11718 0
205. Mader, G. *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography.* Apologetic and Impression Management in the *Bellum Judaicum.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11446 7
206. Nauta, R.R. *Poetry for Patrons.* Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10885 8
207. Adrados, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable.* II: The Fable during the Roman Empire and in the Middle Ages. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11583 8
208. James, A. & K. Lee. *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna,* Posthomerica V. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11594 3
209. Derderian, K. *Leaving Words to Remember.* Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11750 4
210. Shorrock, R. *The Challenge of Epic.* Allusive Engagement in the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11795 4

211. Scheidel, W. (ed.). *Debating Roman Demography.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11525 0
212. Keulen, A.J. *L. Annaeus Seneca* Troades. Introduction, Text and Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12004 1
213. Morton, J. *The Role of the Physical Environment in Ancient Greek Seafaring.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11717 2
214. Graham, A.J. *Collected Papers on Greek Colonization.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11634 6